NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW
NO. DCXLVI.

SEPTEMBER, 1909.

BOND ISSUES FOR PERMANENT NATIONAL IMPROVEMENTS.

BY RICHARD BARTHOLDT.

In the earliest days of the history of our nation the fathers firmly established the policy of pay-as-you-go, and the wisdom of it no one will question when it is applied to conditions as they existed then, or to the current expenses of Government to-day, or in any future time. But during our brief existence we have seen many radical changes take place through the expansion of territory and the colossal growth of commercial interests—of supply and demand—inaugurating a new era, with new necessities which we must consider.

There was a time—and it was not so very long ago—when at least one of the great political parties seriously questioned the constitutionality of internal improvements if undertaken by the national Government. Luckily, that day is so completely passed that the thought is utterly forgotten. But for a long period following the people only indifferently accepted or quietly acquiesced in the new policy of their far-seeing statesmen who sought aid of the Government in the improvement of rivers and harbors as a means of accommodating the growing commerce of the country. Fully realizing the benefits of cheap water transportation—and while a few organizations here and there were petitioning for an established policy of improvement on a larger,

Copyright, 1909, by The North American Review Publishing Company. All Rights Reserved

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

broader scale—the masses of the people were quite content with such appropriations as their representatives could secure from Congress after all of the ordinary needs of the Government in other directions had been met. This period lasted well into the latter part of the last century.

Then there came a great change. The people suddenly awakened first to the importance of improving and maintaining the waterways as natural channels of trade, not alone in competition with the railroads and to regulate railroad rates, but to relieve the railroads of the burden of traffic which was becoming greater than they could bear and to facilitate transportation everywhere to the very great advantage of the whole country. Organizations were formed all over the country for the promotion of special projects, and demands upon Congress for larger appropriations became more and more urgent. The increasing occurrence of freight congestion, always at a time most disastrous to the producer, and the lack of convenient transportation in many localities have stimulated the appreciation of this need until to-day the demand has assumed the proportion of a great popular movement which has drawn into it by its own momentum a large majority of the people of the entire United States. Both political parties are pledged to it and neither can afford to ignore it.

It is the question of the hour; but another arises demanding grave consideration: How shall Congress meet the demand? The increasing cost of Government alone is more and more greedily devouring our entire revenues. There is nothing left for these great improvements. Shall progress be halted? Shall the wheels of Commerce be retarded and all of the benefits which are incalculable be withheld from the people because our revenues do not exceed our expenditures sufficiently to pay for improvements so obviously required to meet the conditions of growth and prosperity in the nation? If that be the reply, I say most earnestly that these improvements will *never* be made either during the life of the present or that of future generations. If we must depend solely upon the annual surplus in the treasury, then we must abandon our demands; for the simple reason that there will either be no surplus at all or it will be so small as not to amount to a drop in the bucket compared with what is absolutely necessary to carry out the great projects confronting us in the necessities now forcing themselves upon the attention of every one.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

We have come gradually up to the point of appreciating these necessities. The need of permanent improvements along various lines has grown upon us slowly. But we do appreciate them to-day, and the people of the United States will not turn back willingly and abandon the demands. Some means must be devised to meet them. Early in 1907, when the movement was still comparatively in its infancy, I introduced in the House of Representatives—the first bill of its kind ever introduced in the House—a bill authorizing the issue of waterway bonds to the amount of $500,000,000 for the purpose of establishing a great national system of improvement. I well remember the scepticism, derision and hostility with which the idea was greeted in many quarters. Even friends of waterway improvements shrugged their shoulders, and the Waterway Congress, while flirting with the idea, did not dare to espouse it openly.

Since then there has been a great change. President Roosevelt and President Taft and the National Rivers and Harbors Congress are on record as heartily endorsing the plan, and another bill has been introduced in Congress with precisely the same end in view.

The public at large has learned to understand and appreciate the need, but possibly has not yet looked deeply into the ways and means, and to give briefly the reasons for my advocacy of specific bond issues for specific permanent improvements may lend some aid to the considerations. It has been and is the practice of Congress to provide first for the running expenses of Government and then, if anything is left, to set it aside for public buildings and other permanent improvements. If all of the revenues are needed for the regular expenses of the national household it is the doubtful privilege of friends of internal improvements to hold the bag. If the Government ever enters upon a policy of broad and systematic internal improvement an annual budget must be provided for the purpose the same as for the army and the navy and for all other departments. Possibly it might be done even now, under a readjustment of expenditures in a way to prevent the military and naval budgets from devouring more than two-thirds of our entire revenue; but for years to come, at least, such a readjustment would be practically impossible. We may live to see the day, but under the present system what must be the result? Suppose that matters shaped

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

themselves so fortunately that three million a year could be appropriated for the proposed fourteen-foot waterway from the Lakes to the Gulf. It would not be finished in fifty years. Must a whole generation go down to the grave before advantages so apparent to all can be secured, because the richest nation on the earth will not do what smaller and poorer ones have done long ago?

No one can possibly contend that it is anything but a question of money, and this being the case, we may well ask whether all of the grand projects of national improvement—whether, for example, the plan to secure navigable channels from the Lakes to the Gulf, in the upper Mississippi, the Missouri, the Ohio and other rivers—must wait until the ordinary revenues have yielded a sufficient surplus to pay for them. I say no—a thousand times no. Already the people have waited too long and too patiently, and from the temper of the conventions which have been held all over the country it is obvious that any good and equitable method of raising the money will meet with public approval and be satisfactory to the people.

The individual mortgages his property, making himself so much the poorer, in a sense, for the increased gain to his business. The Government pledges its integrity in the issue of bonds, increasing its burden only to the extent of the interest, increasing the real value of the country manifold for every dollar expended, developing and increasing the earning power of commercial interests, increasing the wealth of the whole country as well as increasing the revenues of the Government to an extent wholly out of proportion with the increased burden—which looked at in some lights is not a burden at all, but a blessing. For example: to authorize the issue of $500,000,000 of bonds during a period of ten years would suffice to complete all of the great waterway projects throughout the entire country which have already received the official recommendation of the United States Engineer Corps, and would forever solve the problem of the permanent improvement of our great waterways. It can be done in this way. It cannot be done in any other way.

I am well aware of the prejudice which exists against an issue of bonds in time of peace. It is a prejudice which originates in our most excellent pay-as-you-go system and is thoroughly justified if the Government proposes to mortgage the future for

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

present running expenses. But when we contemplate an extraordinary expenditure, assuring a fabulous return in the progress and prosperity of the country for every dollar, with its guaranties of permanent investment for the lasting benefit, not of the present alone, but of all future generations, the case is very different and the prejudice is unfounded. No living American has dreamed of objecting to the issue of bonds to cover the cost of the Panama Canal, though this is a gigantic work which we have undertaken for the whole world—really more for the outside world than for ourselves, because as a nation we are practically without a merchant marine to take advantage of the benefits of the canal. Why, then, should there be objection to the same method and to undertaking the gigantic work of a complete system of internal waterways at no greater cost, requiring no more time, the inestimable and untold benefits of which would be exclusively in the interests of the people of all the United States? Ought not charity to begin at home? Surely it will not be urged that the Panama Canal can be as important to Americans as a great system of waterways through the heart of our own continent. But even if the projects were of equal importance, why not meet the demands at home by the same means with which we are meeting them abroad?

An incorrect impression has obtained in some quarters, endorsed by a statement recently made by a justice of the Supreme Court on the lecture platform, that we are running in debt. He must have had State and municipal indebtedness in mind, for as to the nation the assertion is hardly justified. On account of the Spanish war we issued $198,000,000 three-per-cent. bonds, and $30,000,000 of two-per-cent. bonds have been sold toward the construction of the Panama Canal. These were extraordinary expenses. On the other hand, the Government has redeemed two-per-cent. bonds of the loan of 1891 amounting to twenty-five and a half million. For the sinking fund it has purchased $87,000,000 of the bonds belonging to the three, four and five per cent. loans, which is really a reduction of the national debt, since March, 1897, of $112,000,000. Incidentally, in the conversion of the three, four and five per cent. bonds to two per cent., $10,000,000 annually is saved in interest charges. In other words, but for the extraordinary expenditures our national debt has been reduced more than $112,000,000 during the last two

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

years, and the interest saved by the conversion of the bonds would pay the entire interest on the $500,000,000 loan for a great system of waterways.

Those who have simply imbibed the national prejudice against bonded indebtedness and have not looked carefully into the subject with a definite object in view may be interested in a comparison of the United States with other great nations in this particular. In round numbers:

The national debt of the United States is	$994,000,000
That of France is	6,000,000,000
That of Russia is	4,000,000,000
Great Britain	4,000,000,000
Italy	3,000,000,000
Spain	2,000,000,000
Austro-Hungary	1,000,000,000
The German Empire, plus the debts of the German States	4,000,000,000
The United States, plus the debts of all the States	1,178,000,000

The national debt of France, with not half of our population, is six times as large as ours; yet France, in her small territory, has expended more on river improvements since the Franco-German war than America has expended since the formation of the Government.

National economists have long since ceased to regard public debt as an unmixed evil. It not only affords in Government bonds the safest security for careful investors, but every one who has money invested in the Government finds his interest increased in its maintenance; and in the United States, where Government bonds are the recognized basis for national bank-note circulation, such bonds are a commercial necessity of the first importance. So there are ways in which a national debt is a national blessing; and while there is surely a limit beyond which national credit would be strained, beyond which, for other obvious reasons, it would not be wise to impose a bonded indebtedness, few, I think, will deny that the United States might very materially increase the Government debt without detriment and with some benefit, so that if the cause be worthy the prejudice against bond issues for permanent improvements ought to be abandoned at once.

Is the cause of a system of waterways worthy? Outside of those interested it may not be thoroughly comprehended; but it is a fact that the great rivers of the West are doomed to complete abandonment, and that in the near future, as means of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

commercial intercourse, unless a national loan for their improvement makes their redemption possible. If the actual situation were generally known, nothing short of a bond issue would satisfy the people of the nation. The chances for all the great projects of permanent betterment of the country, now so alive in the hearts of the people, are hopeless and will remain so as long as we must content ourselves with the crumbs which fall from the Government table. In fact, it becomes better and better apparent that there will be no crumbs at all. Our expenditures are already exceeding our revenues by many millions of dollars, and the public economy which is promised by Congress for the future simply means the cutting off of what little has been received heretofore for the permanent benefit and progress sought along these lines.

These are the reasons which have impelled me to assume the responsibility of advocating a bond issue for permanent improvements, and I think they must convince any thoughtful man that the logic of the situation demands this course not only to prepare for the future, as is our absolute duty, instead of exhausting and depleting our present resources, not only to keep pace with and facilitate as we ought the progress and prosperity of the whole country for the benefit of coming generations, but to secure to-day for the consumers and producers of America the benefits of cheaper and more convenient transportation and the increased facilities made imperatively necessary in the immediate present if we would not deliberately check the growth of which we are so proud and retard the increasing commerce which represents the wealth of the country.

For the present and the future the demand for these great improvements is imperative, and a bond issue is the just and equitable means of meeting them, as well as the only means; for it lays a fair proportion of the burden for the works upon the future generations which will reap largely of the benefits; while it must also be borne in mind that every succeeding year under the benefits to be derived by the nation from these improvements will make the burden lighter, because it will increase the wealth and the earning power of the country and the revenues of the Government from which the incurred indebtedness must be met. As a business proposition it is wholly advisable. As a national duty it is imperatively necessary.

RICHARD BARTHOLDT.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

DIVORCE IN AMERICA AND ENGLAND.

BY "BRITANNICUS."

In her latest novel, "Daphne, or Marriage à la Mode," Mrs. Humphry Ward, perhaps with a little less freshness and flexibility than usual, has grappled once more with a great social question. Her choice this time has fallen on the American divorce laws and their reflex action upon American womanhood, upon domestic life and upon the general position of marriage in the scheme of American society. From the standpoint of one who is a sociologist rather than a literary critic there is, of course, an essential unfairness in treating such a theme through the medium of the novelist's art. The unfairness consists in the impression which the reader necessarily receives that one or two selected instances are to be taken as representing the whole. Working on a small canvas, with vivid and telling colors, and concerned less with social phenomena in the mass than with their influence upon the clash of personality and environment or right and wrong or sex and sex in individual cases, the novelist can scarcely hope to escape the fate of those who would survey a continent through a telescope. Every social investigator should have something of the novelist in him, should keep an eye, that is, for the drama and verities of life behind generalized "conditions" and serried statistics; but there is no reciprocal obligation on the novelist to be also an expert in scientific research. Mrs. Humphry Ward, I gladly admit, is too deft and experienced an artist to overload her pages with "awful examples." She gives, indeed, only two illustrations of the disastrous consequences that follow or that may follow the lax divorce laws and their laxer administration in some of the Western States. Neither illustration appeals to me as quite typical of the America I know. Mrs. Verrier, a member of "the strictest sect of New York's social *élite*," had married a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Jew, had tried to get him into society and failed, had found herself in danger of being dropped by her old set and had ended by divorcing him. "Then, one night about a year ago, he took the train to Niagara—of course it was a very commonplace thing to do—and two days afterwards he was found, thrown up by the whirlpool; you know, where all the suicides are found." Mrs. Verrier made an effort to brazen the thing out, but with only partial success. Something resembling a conscience awoke in her; remorse and ostracism combined to wreck her health and beauty; and her last act before she died was to write a letter recanting her early view of marriage as "something we may bend or break as we will" and imploring a young friend who likewise had obtained a divorce for no sufficient reason to return to her husband and ask his forgiveness.

But Mrs. Verrier's case is merely episodical. It is in Daphne Floyd, the American heiress of Irish and Spanish-American parentage, that Mrs. Humphry Ward traces most fully and carefully the workings of the South Dakota divorce code. Daphne becomes the wife of a handsome young Englishman who, while caring for her and coming in time to love her, marries her mainly for her money. He is weak, but not irredeemably; stupid, but in the pleasant English fashion; immature, but, except on the æsthetic side, not beyond the possibility of development—just the ordinary commonplace man, in short, whom the right woman makes and the wrong woman mars. For the first three years all goes reasonably well. It is only when they settle down with their daughter on the ancestral estate in England that trouble begins. Daphne soon finds herself hopelessly at odds with the whole spirit of her surroundings. The formation and narrowness of English country life rouse in her all the latent elements of "racial" antagonism. She shocks the Archdeacon by the ultra-liberality of her views on divorce. She collides with her mother-in-law over the question of decorations. She undertakes to point out to her neighbors their manifold defects of artistic taste. There is a sort of struggle between Daphne and her environment to determine which shall civilize the other. Its issue is still undecided when the appearance of a former *fiancée* of her husband, who had thrown him over when he lost his money, gives a new turn to Daphne's troubles. Mrs. Fairmile is a very clever study in the feminine siren. She sets out in the most approved spirit

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of deviltry to recapture the affections of her old lover, and, while she does not succeed, she plays him with sufficient dexterity to make Daphne furiously jealous. The man himself, while too good a fellow to succumb to her wiles, is too indecisive and too stupid wholly to disentangle himself. He lies about her to Daphne, weakly and unnecessarily, and Daphne, discovering it, feels that her marriage has lost the essential basis of trust and respect and that she owes it not merely to herself, but to "Womanhood" to free herself from a tie stained by falsehood and baseness. Some inherited instinct of lawlessness and revolt surges up anew through her passionate Southern blood. She begins at once to plan her escape. She contrives a scene in which it is made to appear that her husband has knocked her down. She leaves him, taking the child with her, goes straight to South Dakota, with an array of bribed witnesses to testify to "cruelties" and "indignities," turns the yellow press upon her husband when he attempts to follow her and finally secures her decree with the custody of the child. The husband, still in the eyes of English law a married man, goes to the bad; the child dies; and Daphne devotes herself feverishly to art-collecting, philanthropy and the "woman movement." Ultimately she is brought round to some sense of what she has done, and with a woman's unwillingness to admit the irremediable makes a futile effort at reconciliation.

Mrs. Humphry Ward, however, puts into the mouths of her characters some tolerably precise opinions on the general question uncomplicated by the special circumstances of the two cases she has picked out for dissection. She makes, for instance, an American declare that "the most significant thing in American life just now" is—not the divorce laws, it goes deeper than that—but "a complete transformation of the idea of marriage"; and in a letter written by an English clergyman to an American friend she most ably reproduces what is, I suppose, the common English and European view of the matter—that is to say, that the American divorce laws are a species of moral anarchy, that they are slowly disintegrating the very foundations of society, that there are "divine avenging forces" which will exact a heavy and inexorable penalty, and that America as a nation "must either retrace some of the steps taken or sink in the scale of life."

I confess, as an Englishman who has spent some years in the United States, to having long been interested in and puzzled by

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the American divorce laws. Indeed, the whole American attitude towards divorce at once entices and defies the analytical foreigner. The foreigner who does not analyze finds no difficulty in settling the matter offhand. He counts up the number of American divorces, he reads of the chaotic medley of the American divorce laws, and at once thanks God that he belongs to a country where some respect for the sanctity of the marriage tie still lingers. I doubt whether all Americans realize how much their divorce courts have to do with framing the European estimate of American morals and civilization. Even the foreigner who knows nothing else about America knows that it is the land of easy divorce. The inference that it is also the land of lax morality easily follows, and as the oddities or defects of the American social structure are a by no means displeasing topic abroad, it is an inference that finds an immense acceptance, and anything that helps to bear it out may be assured of a genuine European welcome. The American publicist, for instance, who declared a few years ago that "marriage as an institution hardly exists among us any more than in the fifth century at Rome, when twenty wives in succession was not thought an extravagant allowance even for a Christian deacon," was immediately hailed abroad as the solitary voice for righteousness in a godless commonwealth. And I need hardly say that a prodigious reception was given to the recent report of the Census Bureau on the divorces from 1887 to 1906. In England, especially, that report was made the text of innumerable homilies, and I am far from denying that it contained a good deal of somewhat startling material. It showed, for instance, that one American marriage in every twelve ends in the divorce courts and that in the period under review divorces increased three times as fast proportionately as population. In two-thirds of the suits the wife was the plaintiff. Only 15 per cent. of the actions were contested, "and probably in many of these cases," added the report, "the contest was hardly more than a formality." Of the divorces granted to wives 33 per cent. were on account of desertion, 27 per cent. for cruelty, only 10 per cent. for adultery and 5 per cent. for drunkenness. Of the divorces granted to husbands some 50 per cent. were for desertion, 28 per cent. for infidelity, 10 per cent. for cruelty and slightly over 1 per cent. for drunkenness. To those who do not know America these, naturally, were appalling revelations, and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

foreigners might well be excused if they found them difficult to reconcile with the eulogies on "the purity of domestic life" which they understand to be one of the stock features in every Fourth-of-July oration. But those who have had an opportunity of becoming even moderately conversant with American life and conditions will not, I imagine, regard the report of the Census Bureau as more than superficially dismaying.

That the divergences and contradictions of the American divorce laws have their root in the uncontrollable liberty of the States seems to me undoubtedly the fact. State pride and patriotism almost make it a point of honor that each local Legislature, on all conceivable subjects, should have a policy of its own and should not tamely reproduce the enactments of other communities. A sort of rivalry in legislative experiment is generated by the close juxtapositions of the Federal system, by its multiplication of competitive loyalties and the pitting of State against State in a vast lawmaking tourney. No State is going to do so humdrum and spiritless a thing as meekly to copy the example of another State. If one State forbids divorces on any grounds that is a good argument why its neighbor should grant them on all grounds. Then, again, there is the factor of State selfishness. It is still a profitable business for a State to have free and easy divorce laws, just as it is a profitable business for a State to have lax and accommodating corporation laws. It attracts custom. The lawyers and hotelkeepers thrive on it. Little communities of would-be *divorcees* spring up here and there within its boundaries, and the State stands a very fair chance of becoming a perpetual holiday resort, open all the year round, with no close season. But this, after all, is not so great a contributing influence as the American passion for empirics. I sometimes amuse myself by running through the statute-books of some of the Far Western States. I can always rely on finding in them a mass of legislative idealism, of cheerful contempt for all human experience, of still more cheerful confidence in the virtue of the political "short cut," such as history, outside the French Revolution, can hardly parallel anywhere. The lawmakers in these Arcadian communities are the champion patent-medicine curers of the world and all its ills. When anything is brought to their notice that they disapprove of they waste no time trying to regulate it. They simply and comfortably abolish it. Thus in a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

typical Western State you have only to look at the statute-book to see that immorality and gambling and drunkenness and cigarette-smoking by boys, and all the other infirmities of our civilization, so far from flourishing, cannot even exist. They have been decreed out of the very chance of life, annihilated and made an end of. The legislators, in a word, have declared that these things shall not be. And so, of course, they are not.

This genius for social panaceas swoops with easy avidity upon the whole field of marriage and divorce. Given legislators who have unfaltering faith in their ability to turn out a new heaven and a new earth at least once a session, it is inevitable that they should be most piquant, most untrammelled, and in every way most astounding when they come to deal with the relations of husband and wife. The past weighs with them not at all; of traditions they have none; their guides are the local sentiment of people like unto themselves, their own elementary freshness of heart and emotion, which is one of Nature's gifts to Americans, and that infectious sense of all things being possible which propagates itself so easily in their buoyant atmosphere. To men of such propensities and worked upon by such influences, no field, as I have said, could be more inviting or more crowded with opportunities than that of marriage and divorce. A bold occupation and development of it has come all the easier to Americans through their ingrained and impregnable indifference to theological considerations—they are the only people who, while essentially religious, have kept the Churches in their proper place —through their intense individualism and through their easy-going, sometimes misguided, often over-indulgent, but none the less real and vital sense of chivalry. They are honorably ambitious to diffuse as much individual freedom and happiness, and to prevent as much unhappiness, as possible; and the ambition is one that operates with peculiar force whenever the comfort or peace of mind of women is in question. It is, perhaps, more than anything else, with a view to promoting the welfare of women and to asserting their right to a social and legal equality with men, that the American divorce laws have been framed in a spirit of such pronounced liberality. And in these days when lawmakers are more criticised than thanked, it is pleasant to see the highly practical and gratifying fashion in which American women have marked their sense of this legislative solicitude. The

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fact that two-thirds of the divorce suits are brought by women is a compliment to American legislators that they have fully earned.

No one who fairly weighs these conditions and their consequences will expect them to result in anything but anarchy. Anarchical is, indeed, the only adjective that gives any idea of the affluent incredibilities of the American divorce laws. From South Carolina, which grants no absolute divorces, to Tennessee, which grants them on twelve different grounds, there is no possible experiment which has been left untried and no element of confusion which has been omitted. You find one sovereign State refusing to recognize a divorce granted in another sovereign State. You find a man who has been divorced by his wife in Ohio and has subsequently remarried, arrested and convicted for bigamy in New York. You find the Supreme Court solemnly releasing the State of New York from any obligation to give full faith and credit to a decree of divorce obtained in Connecticut. You find a full circle of diversity on almost every point of practice, procedure, the rules of evidence, alimony, the question of remarriage and the period necessary to establish a legal residence. Some States, for instance, admit confessions without restrictions; in others they are only admitted when corroborated; in others, again, they are not admitted at all. Here a divorce trial must be public; there the question is left open. Sometimes it must be trial by jury; sometimes by two juries; sometimes it is optional, at the request of either party. Fourteen States make no provision for separation. In others separation may, at the option of the plaintiff, be decreed for any cause that justifies absolute divorce; and in yet others the matter is left to the discretion of the court. Again, six months are held to constitute a legal residence in five States; a year in thirty-four States; two years in five States; and three years in four States. In twenty-six States remarriage is permitted without any qualification. In others it is granted, withheld or limited, as the courts please. Some States encourage, and others specifically forbid, the guilty party to marry a co-respondent. In Maine the innocent party may not marry within two years without the court's permission and the guilty party is forbidden to remarry at all unless the court consents. The question of jurisdiction, again, is as wide and diverse as the continent itself. So, too, is that of service, of alimony, of an

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

innocent wife's right to resume her maiden name, of the division of property after a divorce, of the time within which a suit must be brought after the discovery of the cause, of the whole treatment of uncontested cases, and of the date on which a decree takes effect—until finally in the grounds for divorce and in the interpretations put upon them by the various courts all these divergences reach their unique and supreme climax.

These are only a few, the mere fringe, of the anomalies of the American divorce laws, and I do not envy the man or the body that would attempt to bring them into harmony or to frame a single uniform code applicable all over the Union and acceptable to the varying needs, conditions and views of nearly fifty States. Of late years there has sprung up in America an undoubted reaction against the laxity of the present system or lack of system. This reaction has resulted in two reforms. It has diminished the grounds on which a divorce may be granted, and it has extended the period necessary to establish a legal residence. Public opinion, moreover, has forced State after State to go out of the divorce business; and no end of conferences have been held with a view to promoting a greater uniformity in the laws. Not very much has been achieved. The differences not merely in the actual provisions of the various codes, but still more conspicuously in the spirit behind them, are so fundamental as to make even approximate uniformity appear unattainable. Some States, I take it, will always incline towards Cardinal Gibbons's way of thinking, and others will always favor the sort of divorce law that Zwingli or Milton might have framed. To reconcile them to subscribing to a common code by methods of persuasion and argument seems to me pretty well hopeless, and to expect an amendment to the Constitution that will remove the whole question from the sphere of State control is, in my judgment, not less chimerical. Nor am I at all convinced that a uniform law is either desired or desirable. As with so many other things in America, the divorce laws and the records of the divorce courts appear far worse on paper than they are in fact. No one who really knows the country would argue for one moment that they connote a low standard of morals or an unusual degree of domestic unhappiness. Americans in these respects are probably better and not worse off than the peoples of Europe. The mere fact that of every hundred divorces less than twenty involve a question

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of infidelity is warning enough against any assumption of immorality; while the further facts that two-thirds of the suits instituted are brought by wives and that in only fifteen per cent. of all the divorce proceedings is there any pretence of a contest, emphasize the dangers of wholesale and offhand judgments.

Personally, I find myself in a good deal of sympathy with Professor Münsterberg's views on this question. He ascribes the frequency of American divorces and the liberality of the divorce laws to "the democratic spirit of self-determination which wants to loosen bonds that individuals no longer freely recognize"; and he adds that "it might be said that this is a higher individual morality which ends marriage when it has lost its inner sanctity." There is a good deal of truth in this, just as there is in Professor Gidding's contention that the high ratio of American divorces is a proof of "the elevated standard of decency and intelligence and the high-spirited character" of American women. American women have been both prompted from within and encouraged from without to take in many ways a higher, or, at any rate, a freer, position in the social scheme than the women of European countries have ever thought of occupying. They have developed in their relations with men a greater sensitiveness or, it may be, a greater self-respect; they certainly exact more, and more is, as certainly, given them; and a great many of the divorce suits in which the wife is the plaintiff are undoubtedly brought because the American wife will not tolerate the treatment that her European sister is both legally and conventionally forced to submit to. The English clergyman in Mrs. Humphry Ward's novel is impressed by the fact that it is apparently only in a minority of cases that an American woman, when she has got rid of her husband, marries some one else. "It is not passion, therefore," he argues, "that dictates many of these actions; no serious cause or feeling, indeed, of any kind; but rather an ever-spreading restlessness and levity, a readiness to tamper with the very foundations of society, for a whim, a nothing!—in the interests, often, of what women call their 'individuality.'" That point of view has undoubtedly a certain justification, but on the whole, and paradoxical as it may seem, there are aspects in which the great and growing average of American divorces may be claimed as an index not of a lower, but of a higher civilization.

I have, moreover, a very definite impression that the bulk of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

feminine opinion in America is opposed to a uniform law because they know that it would be a stricter law. One of the most distinguished American women of this generation declared that "States with liberal divorce laws are to women what Canada was to the slaves before emancipation," and warned her sex that a national or a uniform code would deprive them of most of their present privileges. That, I think, is unquestionably true, and it explains why the Churches are so anxious to hand the whole matter over to Congress. But American opinion has never been very amenable to sacerdotal guidance, and in this case there is less chance than in most that it will forsake the strictly secular standpoint. The average American, so far as I can gauge his views, looks upon divorce not as a disease, but as a remedy. He believes almost anything to be preferable to the manacled misery in which hundreds of thousands of the women of Europe eat out their lives; and he is determined that his own countrywomen shall not share their fate. He is rightly and deeply convinced of the soundness at the core of American life and morals. He admits the abuses and inconveniences which State regulation has produced, and he does not deny that it is an anomaly that a man should not know whether his marriage or divorce is equally valid in all parts of the Union; but he argues that time and the growing sense of responsibility among American legislators are gradually bringing about all the change that is needed; and he is instinctively opposed to anything that would inject into the divorce laws a strictness uncongenial to the American atmosphere. An occasional scandal and even a number of proved abuses cannot blind him to the enormous amount of unhappiness from which the liberality of the State divorce laws has rescued the men and women of America.

Within the last few years the English law of divorce and separation has been denounced by judge after judge. The President of the Divorce Court himself declared, in 1906, that it was "full of inconsistencies, anomalies and inequalities amounting almost to absurdities," and that it "encouraged immorality and produced deplorable results." A few months ago the same high authority asserted that "in divorce-court procedure there is now one law for the rich and another for the poor"; and two or three days later one of the justices in the Court of Appeal pronounced it to be "the serious reproach of our existing divorce

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

laws that the relief they grant is practically out of the reach of the working-classes in this country by reason of expense and the absence of local courts empowered to grant it." To obtain a divorce in England costs at the very least $500 and a year of time, and London is the only city in the country where the trial can be held and the decree granted. That in itself is an obvious and formidable defect of procedure. It means that the great majority of those who are entitled to the relief of a divorce are financially unable to obtain it. But that is a technical shortcoming slight in comparison with the one-sidedness and injustice of the law itself. In England a husband can divorce his wife if he is able to prove to the satisfaction of a judge and jury that she misconducted herself on a single occasion. No such privilege belongs to the wife. An English wife cannot divorce her husband even though he is living in open adultery. She is obliged, in order to free herself, to prove that he has been guilty not only of unfaithfulness, but also of cruelty, or else that he has wilfully deserted her for not less than two years. All the redress she is able to obtain for the infidelity of her husband unaccompanied by cruelty or desertion is a separation order from a magistrate. As a rule, a separation order allows her from one-fourth to one-third of her husband's income, though whether she will ever receive it is problematical. At the same time, it estops her from ever afterwards suing for divorce, and it prevents both husband and wife from remarrying. Thus the greater offence is visited by the lighter punishment. A husband guilty of unfaithfulness *plus* cruelty or desertion is divorced and permitted to remarry. But a husband guilty of unfaithfulness only is separated from his wife under conditions that allow neither of them to remarry.

Some nine or ten thousand of these separation orders are issued yearly. This means that every year nearly 20,000 people are turned loose on society under unnatural conditions. Not one of them can remarry so long as his or her former partner is alive. The law condemns them to a permanent celibacy, which is equivalent to saying that the law puts a premium on immorality. The Act permitting and regulating the issue of separation orders was passed in 1895. In the thirteen years of its active operation it has probably been responsible for throwing on the world from 150,000 to 200,000 persons, each one of whom, in the emphatic

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

words of a great English lawyer, is "a potential adulterer," without any legal family ties or any possibility of contracting them, and licensed by the law to indulge his or her passions with impunity. Lax divorce laws may be an evil, but the rigorous code of England is a far greater and more potent source of moral corruption. Again, there are in England some 60,000 married men and women who are certified as insane; but as the law recognizes only adultery as a ground for divorce, the husbands and wives of these 60,000 lunatics are unescapably tied to them. A man may be an habitual drunkard or a slave to drugs or sentenced to prison for life, or may desert his home and family, may refuse to contribute anything to their support or may even decline to cohabit with his wife, and yet, under the laws of England, always more careful of the rights of property than of persons, the wife cannot divorce him. The utmost she can do is to obtain a separation order, the chief effect of which will be to place beyond reach of the law whatever illicit connections he or she may care to form. A growing body of opinion is being organized in England against the maintenance of a system so prolific of injustice and so conducive to immorality; but no one who recalls, or has read of, the fanatical opposition that had to be overcome before the English law of divorce reached even its present meagreness of liberality—no one who realizes the power of the sacerdotal tradition in English affairs—can doubt that a long and bitter struggle will have to be fought before separation orders are abolished, before both sexes are placed on an equality in the matter of divorce, before decrees are granted in cases of lunacy or of long terms of imprisonment or of habitual drunkenness or desertion, and before the English divorce code is brought up to the level of a modern and enlightened State. The British have gone as far towards one extreme as the Americans towards the other; but from the standpoint of the social well-being of the community there cannot, I think, be much question that the American system is the less harmful of the two.

"BRITANNICUS."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"HUDSON'S RIVER."

BY MONTGOMERY SCHUYLER.

"So accordingly it was decided: and Saxon Becket spilt his life in Canterbury Cathedral, as Scottish Wallace did on Tower Hill, and as generally a noble man and martyr has to do—not for nothing: no, but for a divine something other than *he* had altogether calculated." How these eloquent words of Carlyle's, in "Past and Present," come back to us as we review the history of the discovery of America, beginning with Columbus in the fifteenth century and ending, after a space of more than three centuries, with Lewis and Clark in the nineteenth. A shorter passage to the Indies, that was the goal of American discoveries for a century and a quarter from Columbus to Hudson. The misconception survives to this day, in the geographic misnomer of the West "Indies," in the ethnographic misnomer of the North-American "Indians." Poor Columbus, the Moses of the new "traffics and discoveries," had not even the luck of the old Moses in being vouchsafed a sight from some Pisgah of his new and more than promised land. He died without the sight which was reserved for

> "stout 'Balboa' when with eagle eyes
> He stared at the Pacific, and his men
> Look'd at each other with a wild surmise—
> Silent, upon a peak in Darien."

So many heroes, from Columbus to Hudson, took their lives in their hands and fared forth into the unknown upon the faith of a scientific conception of the rotundity of the world; so many of them upon the faith of a scientific misconception. The misconception became an obsession, and for near a century survived the actual circumnavigation of Magellan in 1520. The story is

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

doubtless most brilliantly, and at the same time most cursorily, sketched in John Fiske's "Discovery of America." It is, however, in his "Dutch and Quaker Colonies" that the picturesque historian sets forth the obsession of the navigators of the early seventeenth century. Giovanni da Verrazano, in a voyage in 1523, three years after Magellan's great achievement, which Magellan likewise did not live to complete, hypothesized, and his brother Girolamo charted and published a huge amorphous body of water in the latitude of Virginia, divided from the Atlantic at one point by only six miles of terra firma and thence continuous with the great South Sea. It was an alluring conception for the traders of the period, perhaps not less but more alluring after Magellan had actually shown the feasibility of an uninterrupted water-borne traffic between the main of Europe and the main of Asia. The American continent, in the conception of those times, was a mere strip of interruption between Europe and the Far East, a strip which, if permeable anywhere, would reduce Magellan's tedious circuit to a "great circle course" of plain sailing. One and all, for a century and more, the explorers were "bound for th' isles of Javan or Gadier." Hence the keels of the European traders vexed the waters of every promising estuary and inlet from Panama to the Arctic Circle, seeking the through route which all were persuaded existed, and withdrawing when they encountered a definitive "no thoroughfare." To understand the obstinacy of this delusion one must, as Freeman says and as Fiske repeats, "free himself from bondage to the modern map," and attempt the point of view of men who were living and sailing and exploring before the modern map was possible. It is, in truth, the heroic efforts they made under their strong delusion that have made the modern map.

Thus far Mr. Fiske was on safe ground. His ground becomes a little more shaky when he says, with regard to the Hudson River, that there is "no sort of doubt that it was visited by many Europeans before Hudson," even though we may have to concur in his conclusion that "there can be no doubt whatever as to Verrazano's entering New York Harbor" (in 1524). One thinks the historian protests rather too much. And when he waxes exceeding bold, and declares that "there can be little doubt" that French skippers ascended as far as the site of Albany in order to get furs from the Mohawks," and states as

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a fact the ingenious conjecture of Mr. Weise that "about 1540 they built a fort on a long, low island on the west side of the river near the present southern limits of the City of Albany," as well as another on the present site of Chatham Square, one demands much more evidence of these astonishing propositions than he obtains.

But however all this may be, and however the insubstantial pageant of the French fort of the sixteenth century may have faded and left not a rack behind, it has to be admitted that in this voyage, of which the discovery of the great river that bears his name was an incident, as in the subsequent voyage in which he found the great bay that bears his name, and "spilt his life" in the discovery, Hudson's object was quite ulterior. He was trying to break through the great North-American continent which he did not figure as great, nor hardly as a continent, to find the Great South Sea. The American mainland was to him, in either latitude, no goal or object, only an interrupting incident, an annoying obstacle. So soon as he found that he reached the head of navigation, even for the little "Half Moon," without so much greater draught of water than the subsequent "North River sloop" constructed especially to skim those shallows, he 'bouted ship and sought again the open sea to try elsewhere for a likelier aperture. Not more than to Columbus was any vision or hint vouchsafed to him of the great thing he had really done in finding the head of navigation of the Hudson.

Three hundred years later, with the city at the mouth of the Hudson, in the growth and greatness of which the Hudson has been the indispensable factor,—with New York already "in sight" and in rivalry of London as the greatest aggregation of human beings on the surface of the planet, and, according to the rate of past increase, to take first place in less than half a generation of men, we are in better case to appreciate Hudson's achievement. "Saul, the son of Kish, went forth to seek his father's asses and found a kingdom." That would still be the relation of Henry Hudson's quest to his conquest if he had attained his quest. To seek a passage to Ind and Far Cathay *viâ* Troy, New York, is an errand which might excite ridicule among those cognizant of the modern map if Hudson and the explorers of his generation were not lifted so far above the reach of ridicule by the indomitable courage with which they ventured upon the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

unknown. Hudson scored off his venture as a failure when he had arrived at what was so clearly the innavigable head of navigation in the ascent of the great river, withdrew, like the others, his contemporaries and predecessors, to pursue in more promising quarters his endeavors to break through the barrier and to find the line of least resistance. If his geography had been as accurate as it could not help being inaccurate, if he had found the short cut to the farthest East, what a trivial thing would he have accomplished compared with what he actually did accomplish in finding the gateway of the North-American continent and opening a practicable, and the only practicable, passage to its boundless "hinterland"! Yet of this his real achievement, so transcending his highest hopes and desires, he never, to the day of his death, entertained the least suspicion. "Not for nothing: no, but for a divine something other than *he* had altogether calculated."

The immediate effects of Hudson's episodical and disappointing exploration of his namesake river were not impressive. Mrs. Van Rensselaer, in her "History of the City of New York," sums them up with judicial impartiality and judicial brevity: "Before the 'Half Moon' sailed away a number of red men had taken three steps toward civilization. They had seen the effect of firearms, they had got drunk, and they had learned to want European goods." But these unfamiliar experiences (unfamiliar *pace* Mr. Weise and Mr. Fiske and their supposititious French fort at Albany in 1540) were destined to have epochal consequences. For Hudson had happened to come upon precisely the one natural gateway of the continent, the one practicable gap in the whole Appalachian coast range. That accomplished and charming man, the late Horatio Seymour, Governor of the State of New York, used to be very eloquent and luminous on this theme, on the relation of the topography of the Hudson Valley to the history of New York and of the Union. I heard him on it at the first commencement of Cornell. How wonderfully lucky was Hudson's landfall—if you can describe as a landfall a grounding in the mud! For here was the *débouchement* upon the river, and hence by a short and simple navigation upon the ocean, of the already immemorially beaten trail from the westward of the Iroquois, the people of the "Long House." When the Dutch set up, so few years afterwards, their trading-station

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

at Fort Orange to buy the peltry which was the only thing the savages had to sell that Europe cared to buy, the door was already open to their market at Albany. And the Dutch attached the wild trappers by justice and fair dealing. True, they had an adventitious advantage, which was another of Hudson's unconscious strokes of luck. John Fiske well says of Champlain's fight at Ticonderoga, the tercentenary of which we have just been celebrating:

> "On the July day when the Frenchman's thunder and lightning so frightened those dusky warriors, a little Dutch vessel named the 'Half Moon' was at anchor in Penobscot Bay. A few weeks later the 'Half Moon' dropped anchor above the site of Troy, and within the very precincts over which the warriors of the Long House kept watch. How little did Henry Hudson imagine what a drama had already been inaugurated in those leafy solitudes! A few shots of an arquebus on that July morning had secured for Frenchmen the most dangerous enemy, and for Dutchmen and Englishmen the most helpful friend that the mysterious American wilderness could afford."

Truly, never was a victory more Pyrrhic than that of Champlain! France had begun by "backing the wrong horse," by allying herself with the unwarlike Algonquins and by "antagonizing" their hereditary enemies, the fierce people of the Five Nations. It was an error expiated throughout the century and a half that followed of struggle for the possession of the American "hinterland," until France was compelled to abandon Canada itself. And through it all the hatred of the Five Nations was a festering thorn in her side, the gateway of Hudson's river opening upon the Iroquois trail was the means by which the wild allies of the English were subsisted and equipped to harry her. The last round of the struggle happened, indeed, to coincide with a general European war. But the English and French duel for the control of America went on and would have gone on quite independently. It was "an irrepressible conflict between opposing and enduring forces." When Macaulay says about Frederick the Great, "That he might rob a neighbor whom he had promised to defend, black men fought on the coast of Coromandel, and red men scalped each other by the great lakes of North America," Macaulay is simply treating himself and his readers to a flourish of rhetoric. The massacre of Schenectady, which showed that the French and their Indians had learned the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

road south from the St. Lawrence to the Hudson, as well as the Dutch and English had learned it northward from their Indians, was perpetrated more than half a century before Frederick came to quarrel with Maria Theresa. The seventeenth century had not expired when the four years' diplomatic duel for the control of "interior" New York was waged by Denonville and Dongan, and the Frenchman had to own that he was getting the worst of it. "They like the manners of the French," he wrote, "but they like the cheap goods of the English better."

To take their own names for the French Governor of Canada and the Dutch or English Governor of New York it was, at any rate, plain that the Five Nations for the ensuing two generations distrusted "Onontio" and trusted "Corlaer" or his successor, "Quidor," the first Mayor of Albany. It was by no means by way of a "junket" that Peter Schuyler, in 1710, took sachems of the Five Nations to London, where all five were lumped as "Mohocks," to do reverence to the Great Mother, if that was what they called Queen Anne. By no means as a junket, since it must have been a grievous and grewsome voyage for him, but as a matter of high policy of which the English got their benefit in the ensuing half-century, until the French flag disappeared from the North-American continent. The French scheme of a chain of forts to restrain the Iroquois was largely conceived. To use our modern nomenclature, a fort at the mouth of the Niagara, a fort at the mouth of the Genesee, a fort at Syracuse, a fort near Oswego, a fort at Ticonderoga—these proposals not only befitted the arrogance of Ludovican France, but did promise to overawe the hostile Indians and to hold in check the fur-traders of Albany. But they had the fatal strategic weakness of conceding to the rival and enemy the "interior lines." The line to Albany was the line of least resistance. The point at which Hudson had grounded and been baffled was the one point at which there was the readiest access from the interior, the readiest outlet to the sea. The dangerous and tortuous navigation of the St. Lawrence in days when it was a fortnight's voyage from Quebec to Montreal up-stream, how could that compete then, any more than it can compete now, with the great river upon the navigable head of which Hudson had so singularly stumbled? The circumstance that Hudson was an Englishman, though working for a Dutch employer, was curiously made, less

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

than a century afterwards, the pretext for a claim of English priority over the Dutch. "I take the liberty to acquaint you," wrote Lord Cornbury from New York to the Secretary of the Lords of Trade in London in 1705, "that this province was first discovered by an Englishman whose name was Hudson, and the river which runs by Albany to this city is to this day called 'Hudson's River' from that man." As a statement of historical fact this is, or until lately was, impeccable; but as the basis for a claim of English sovereignty it leaves us in doubt whether it was more largely an exhibition of the ignorance or of the impudence of the noble lord.

For nearly a century before Cornbury's time the Indians of the Five Nations had been carrying or convoying the peltry from the back districts along the road that Nature had plainly marked out for generations, perhaps for centuries, before there was any market at the head of navigation on the river, certainly for generations, even for centuries, before the indications of Nature were recognized as marking it out for a highway, a waterway or a railway. The parting of the ways was again at Albany—straight away northward for Montreal and the Polar Star; straight away westward, through the haunts of the warlike Iroquois, to the Long House of Onondaga, to the home of the beaver, the only "money crop," whose skin was as exclusive a unit of value in the trade of New York as the hundredweight of tobacco in colonial Virginia. To improve and facilitate these natural highways for traffic inward, for defence outward, that may be said to have been the main problem of colonial New York. Nay, it may be said to have been the main problem of the State of New York. It is by what has been done towards the solution of it by colony, province and State that the State has attained its primacy as the Empire State, the city as the Imperial City. And yet the problem was implicitly propounded and the solution implicitly secured from the September day, three hundred years ago, when the "Half Moon" grounded above Albany and Henry Hudson turned sadly back from what he imagined to be a baffled quest.

The ways, the westward and the northward ways alike, from this point at which merchandise might begin to be sea borne, were woodland paths and waterways. In great preponderance waterways. Northward, to be sure, stretches of trackless forest in-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tervened between the sources of the Hudson and the valley of the St. Lawrence, in spite of Lake George and Lake Champlain and the rivers. But westward the communication with the Hudson, like the future of Germany, "lay upon the water." Such an irriguous region as the "Lake Country" of Central New York, such a network of navigable lakes and rivers, is very rare in the world. One, and only one, serious interruption there was to the progress of canoes from Albany by way of the Mohawk and the lakes and streams to the watershed where the rivers, born in sight of one another, diverged to the Hudson and to Lake Ontario, whence the voyager could make his way equally

> "Where wild Oswego spread her swamps around
> Or Niagara stunned with thunder sound."

This was "the great Oneida carrying-place" close to the present town of Rome, and in its site almost identical with the "Rome Summit level" of the Erie Canal. Here, or just beyond here, was a ramification of the Grand Trunk of the trail, northwestward to Oswego and Lake Ontario, due westward by the chain of smaller lakes to the great Lake Erie. Necessarily this point of confluence and departure was esteemed a vital point as soon as the immigrants from Europe had become aware of the lie of the land. It was not far from here that Sir William Johnson, living in a savage state for a generation, controlled his dusky wards and safeguarded the English pass. Long before his time, when it was a Dutch pass, it had been the object of a similar solicitude. It was the one considerable portage for canoes, the one serious break in the else continuous waterway. To the canal-building Dutchmen it was perhaps more obvious than to others that a canal from the head waters of the Mohawk to the nearest affluent of Oneida Lake was the indispensable link needed to complete the chain of communication. But it seems that it might have been obvious to all the world, as obvious as to "stout Balboa" himself the necessity to the commerce of the world of the Panama Canal. The Rev. John Taylor, penetrating these parts as a missionary in 1902, remarks, as "a very great singularity," that "the waters of the Mohawk and those of Wood Creek, which come within a mile of each other" ["eighty-one chains," Philip Schuyler had reported in 1792] "should admit of a communication by water through canals." But in 1902 there actually was a canal.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The genius came in in seeing the canal "before it was made." And this was seen, or foreseen, and urged for more than one generation in advance. The halt and stumbling-block of Wood Creek had been already too long permitted to obstruct "interstate commerce" before there were any States. Lieutenant-Governor De Lancey, reporting, with justifiable exultation, in 1755, that Captain Bradstreet, in command of the expedition directed to the destruction of the French post at Oswego, had "in three hours' time passed the great carrying-place between the Mohawk River and the Wood Creek with his company, provisions, Battoes and baggage, which is less time than what the traders generally take with a single Battoe when they hasten to the Mart at Oswego," proceeds to rise to something of prophetic strain:

> "The same Battoes which carry the train, provisions, etc., for the army to Oswego may carry them to Niagara, and, being transported above the falls, the same may carry them to Presque Isle, the fort on the south side of Lake Erie, so that it will be practicable to bring the expense of such an expedition into a moderate compass, far less than the expense of wagons, horses, etc., which are necessary in an expedition by land from Virginia to the Ohio."

And that has been as true ever since, in peace and in war, as it was in 1755. Hudson had stumbled upon the line of least resistance from the seaboard to the receding inland frontier. That the "great Oneida carrying-place" should not only be facilitated, but should be fortified as a vital point, was plain enough to all discerning and informed men. But it was not until 1758 that Abercrombie, from his camp on Lake George, sent orders to Stanwix to build Fort Stanwix, on the present site of Rome, as a bulwark against the advance of the French. For that purpose it was late and superfluous to the objects of a war which terminated in a British victory and a French abandonment of North America two years later. But by a stroke of the irony of fate it came into use nineteen years afterwards as a bulwark against the advance of the British, its garrison holding out until Benedict Arnold arrived to relieve them, and sent St. Leger's column back through the wilderness toward Lake Ontario to retrace its long and devious route to Montreal. It was the failure of one of the three columns which, according to the London closet strategists, were to converge and crush the rebels at the head waters of the Hudson. Sir George Trevelyan justly observes

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that the plan of campaign can hardly be accounted for except upon the supposition that the strategists had maps before them from which they assumed that the province of New York was of the area of Gloucestershire and equally well provided with roads practicable for artillery. Of the three columns to which the British War Office had given rendezvous at the head of navigation on the Hudson poor John Burgoyne's was the only one which kept tryst; and it paid for its punctuality by losing one of the decisive battles of the world. For, most curiously, it was Saratoga that determined the re-entry of France into the New World to avenge upon Great Britain her expulsion from it.

No sooner was peace declared and America left at liberty to work out her own salvation than the improvement began of the line of least resistance which Hudson had opened. The Erie Canal was manifest destiny for more than a generation before it was actually built. To improve and complete the waterways to the westward and the northward of the navigable Hudson was not only manifest destiny, but plain duty. Philip Schuyler, of the third generation of his family which had been directly interested in closer communication with the inhabitants, white or red, of the "back country," and who had made a study of canals in Europe before the Revolution, became an equally zealous promoter of communication by canal northward and westward from Albany, and headed the list of directors of both the "Company of the Western Inland Lock Navigation" and the "Company of the Northern Inland Lock Navigation," and procured the passage of the Lock Navigation Law of 1792. It was the day of small things in inland navigation. The *bateau* had superseded the canoe; but still the general's modest proposal was but for "two feet and a half" of water. The story is well worth reading in the most interesting "Waterways and Canal Construction in New York State" with which Dr. Henry Wayland Hill has supplemented Mr. Noble E. Whitford's official "History of New York Canals" with its tabulated statistics and its appalling two hundred pages of bibliography.

The opening of the Hudson to steam navigation two hundred years after the sailing of the "Half Moon" up its waters, of course gave a fillip to laggard destiny. It was quite in the normal course of things that Robert Fulton and his backer, Chancellor Livingston, should have become members of the Canal

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Commission of 1811, and should have done their full share towards producing that state of public opinion which forced the enactment of the law of 1817 that determined the construction of the Erie Canal, and the completion of a "Northwest Passage" so far beyond the wildest dreams of Henry Hudson. Before the construction of the canal a hundred dollars a ton was the freight to Buffalo from Albany as against sixty from Montreal. A legislator calculated that 66,000 tons of freight would be available for the canal and would commercially justify its construction. De Witt Clinton's estimate in 1819 was that freight could be carried from the Hudson to Lake Erie for ten dollars a ton. How ludicrously "conservative" seem these estimates now, since in 1880, its busiest year, the Erie Canal carried 4,500,000 tons, and since Major Symons computes that freight can be moved from Buffalo to tide-water over the new barge canal which is to supersede the Erie for fifty-six cents a ton.

It is true that the canal itself has been largely superseded and has sunk to the comparatively modest function of a regulator of freights by newer and swifter modes of conveyance. But that fact does not modify, except to emphasize, the truth that Hudson found the line of least resistance. Take the history of the Erie road, the hypothenuse of a right-angled triangle, and compare it with the history of the New York Central and Hudson River roads, the other two sides, and be convinced that the mathematical axiom that a straight line is the shortest distance between two points may be a grievous commercial fallacy. If all the watercourses in New York should go dry, including the majestic river itself, their beds would still supply the easiest and cheapest road from the seaboard to the "hinterland," still constitute the line of least resistance. Look at the remarkable map of the waterways of the United States which accompanies Mr. Whitford's "History," and see how all the streams arising in the Atlantic coast range, excepting only "Hudson's River," run "violently down a steep place into the sea," and how the Hudson, flowing parallel with the coast line, at its head of navigation gives access to a broad and level westward way. Of how small account was Henry Hudson's quest compared with his find, which was nothing less than the discovery of the one great open door of the North American continent.

MONTGOMERY SCHUYLER.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

IS MARK TWAIN DEAD?

BY EUGENE H. ANGERT.

MARK TWAIN is dead. Not dead in any literary sense, but literally dead; dead as Aristophanes, as Bunyan, as George Washington, just plain dead. I know this statement will be met with incredulity, perhaps with derision. But, after the proof which I have to offer, no unbiased mind can doubt its truth. The conviction that Mark Twain is no longer alive first flashed upon me, as I read his latest alleged work, "Is Shakespeare Dead?" I at once began an exhaustive investigation. Conjecture gradually grew into certainty, and after the evidence had been accumulated all doubt was gone. I became absolutely certain that Mark Twain was dead. I know this statement will be dismissed by those readers, who resent any disturbance of their too readily accepted beliefs, as the vagary of a crack-brained theorist, if, indeed, they do not ascribe it to a more acute form of mental instability. But should the fear of ridicule compel my silence? Did I not owe to Mark Twain's readers of a century or two hence the moral obligation of publishing my discovery? Ought not future generations be saved from the endless argument, the crimination and recrimination of learned commentators, that surely would convulse the literary world when the authenticity of Mark Twain's later writings was questioned? Should not posterity be spared the phalanx of Twainian critics, whose lives given over to the minutiæ of investigation, might be more profitably employed, and the countless volumes that would be written, and perhaps read, to establish one side or another of the controversy? For, of course, the question, so thoughtlessly ignored by the readers of to-day, whether Mark Twain was the author of his works, would undoubtedly be raised by the literary dilettanti of a hundred years from now. How much better that it should be raised and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

settled in this day and generation! What interminable literary strife, and how many useless volumes we, and those who come after us, would have been spared had some one, during Lord Bacon's lifetime, confronted him with the fresh evidence of the conspiracy to palm off upon the guileless actor, William Shakespeare, the plays and poems which Bacon had himself written and was ashamed to father! If any contemporary of Shakespeare had merely mentioned the deception that must have been known to many, how quickly it would have been ended and the true authorship of Bacon's plays revealed! For if we, out of our great ignorance of Shakespeare's life, are able to establish that he was not the author of his purported plays, how conclusively it could have been demonstrated by one who associated with Shakespeare and knew all about him! And had we been spared the all-absorbing problem of the authorship of Shakespeare's works, which, like Banquo's ghost, will not down, we might now find time to read the plays themselves. No; the indifference of the contemporaries of Shakespeare and Bacon to the great literary deception of their day shall not be imitated by me. The mystery of Mark Twain's writings shall not be left for some learned Ignatius Donnelly or Nathaniel Holmes of a century from now to unravel. The blunderbuss loaded for his destruction shall be fired now, not a couple of hundred years after his death. The evidence of the conspiracy shall be given to the public while it is still fresh and unquestionable.

So indisputable does it appear to me that Mark Twain has been dead for some years that I marvel the public should so long have been deceived. Strange that of all the readers of his latest alleged work, "Is Shakespeare Dead?" I alone have dismissed that academic question for the obvious and more important inquiry it suggested, *Is Mark Twain Dead?*

Let me briefly state the facts as I have gathered them, and then with such particularity as the limits of this article will permit the evidence upon which they rest. Mark Twain died in the year 1906. The exact date and place of his demise I have been unable as yet to discover. But it is undoubtedly true that he passed away during the summer or early fall of that year in an obscure village of Switzerland. For the reading world he has continued to live. Pseudo-humorous writings, in feeble imitation of those which have made him the first of laugh-provokers, have

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

been given to the eager public after the Almighty had silenced the tongue of the teller of tales, and forever deprived the world of the brilliant mind which gave us "Tom Sawyer," "Huckleberry Finn" and "Colonel Mulberry Sellers." In all history no greater literary hoax than this has been perpetrated. The Shakespeare delusion, the Ireland forgeries, the mystery of Junius, the Fiona MacLeod myth, are insignificant deceptions compared with that which is being carried on at the present time by the use of the name of Mark Twain. Of course there is a motive for this fraud, and it is a very obvious one. For many years prior to his death Mark Twain commanded the largest audience of any writer of his day. Not only in America, but throughout Europe, his new books were awaited with as much eagerness as an instalment of a Dickens novel seventy years ago. Not even Kipling or Roosevelt, in the zenith of their literary careers, could so readily mint their words into golden coin. The financial return to his publishers was enormous. But they foresaw that the steady stream of wealth that flowed from Mark's genius must cease at his death. The inexhaustible mine must close when he was no more. The old levels might be worked over, but no new veins of virgin gold could be unearthed and marketed. Mark Twain's passing of the Biblical tenure of threescore-and-ten warned the publishers that this financial catastrophe could not be averted much longer. Then it was that the possibility of keeping him alive indefinitely flashed upon them. If his death, when it occurred, could be kept secret, books written by the publishers' hacks might be given to the gullible public year after year as the latest offerings of Mark Twain. And the mine would, indeed, prove inexhaustible! So with every contingency carefully provided for, it was not difficult, after Mark Twain had quietly passed away, to continue his existence. The fact that his death occurred in an obscure European village made it easy to suppress. As his last years had been spent abroad he was an unfamiliar figure to his own countrymen, and so detection of the imposture was unlikely. An impostor had, of course, to be provided, but the impersonation was much easier than that of the Prince of Zenda, so successfully carried on by Rudolph Rassendyll in the novels of Anthony Hope. Oscar Wilde, in that delightfully truthful essay on "The Decay of Lying," has shown that nature imitates art and that life patterns itself after fiction. And so

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

probably it was the late Edward Everett Hale's story of "My Double and How He Undid Me" that suggested to the conspirators the idea of providing a double for Mark Twain to continue his life after he had laid it down. But whether this be a fact or only a theory, the double was provided and continues to act his part. As often as seems advisable to avoid any suspicion of Mark Twain's death, no oftener, he parades himself in public. These sallies into the limelight are confined to audiences of college girls, to whom the person of the real Mark Twain is about as well known as that of Napoleon. But while his public appearances are infrequent, books and magazine articles that bear the name of Mark Twain are brought forth with rapidly recurring regularity. The conspiracy has succeeded. The public has accepted the counterfeit works as genuine. No pure-food law protects the gullible reader from mislabelled literary pabulum, and the reputation of Mark Twain has been burdened with a mass of serious and solemn writing whose weight even it can scarcely sustain. I can only hope by this exposure to relieve that sacred reputation from additional sorry burdens.

The limits of this article prevent me from mentioning all of the evidence upon which these statements rest, but I shall offer sufficient to convince any fair-minded reader of their truth. Mark Twain's latest works have been copyrighted in the name of the Mark Twain Company. This fact has been widely commented upon by reviewers, but they have seen in it only subject for jest. It possesses a more important significance. The creation of this corporation is a convincing proof that Mark Twain is no longer alive. For what possible pretext can there be for a living author incorporating himself? From the earliest day, when "our father Adam sat him down and scratched with a stick in the mould," down to the latest moment of time, when the maiden effort of the youngest scribe is struggling into print, we search in vain for an instance of a living author turning himself into a corporation. There is no record of any Homeric Consolidated Epic Company, although it has been shown that Homer was a syndicate. No corporate charter was taken out by Dumas, although Dumas was an underwriter of other men's works. We do not find any articles of association filed by the Shakespeare-Bacon-Marlowe Universal Classic Company. Even Andrew Lang, an underwriter of the first magnitude and a most active literary

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

syndicate, has so far denied himself the luxury of incorporating. Every author, ancient or modern, great or small, has cast his work upon the troubled waters of public opinion unprotected by the buoy of a corporate copyright. Surely if there were some reason for this unusual course other authors, equally jealous of fame and fortune, would have turned themselves into corporations. There is, there could be, no reason for incorporating a live Mark Twain; but there was the strongest motive for incorporating the dead Mark Twain. In no other way could the conspirators obtain a valid copyright of the works they published in his name. For, their copyright in Mark Twain's name would be invalid if it was discovered that the author was dead when he applied for it; on the other hand, the discovery of the fraud would not affect the validity of any copyright granted to the Mark Twain Company.

I find strong corroborative evidence that Mark Twain is dead in the articles of incorporation themselves. The Mark Twain Company purports to be a corporation created by Mark Twain for his sole and separate use. Certainly we would expect him to be present at its birth. He would unquestionably be a party to the incorporation of himself. It was hardly the sort of thing to leave to strangers. If his name is not signed to the articles of incorporation as one of the organizers the conclusion is inevitable that it was impossible to obtain his signature. For such impossibility there could be but one reason—he had passed into that shadowy realm from which, in the present state of mediumistic advancement, the only signature he could furnish would be on a slate. Accordingly I turned my attention to the Mark Twain Company and found that it was a corporation chartered by the State of New York on December 28th, 1908. I examined the original articles in the Secretary of State's office and made the startling discovery that *Mark Twain was not one of the organizers of the Mark Twain Company.* His signature does not appear to the agreement which constituted him a corporation. The articles are signed and acknowledged before a Notary Public by three individuals, residents of the City of New York, whose names are unknown to fame. This fact the reader can verify by referring to the corporation records of the State of New York. I maintain, therefore, that the absence of Mark Twain's signature from the papers incorporating him, if not conclusively establish-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ing his death, at least shifts the burden of proof upon those contending that he is alive.

About five years ago Mark Twain announced that he was writing his autobiography which would not be published until one hundred years after his death. This latter statement was so frequently and so emphatically made by the author that it will be readily recalled. Mark Twain was a truthful man; he would not resort to a gross deception for the purpose of advertising a forthcoming book. We can safely assume that he would never permit the autobiography to be given to the public during his lifetime. But about two years ago the first instalment of this very work appeared in a magazine and further instalments followed for over a year. What more conclusive evidence could there be that Mark Twain is dead? He always kept faith with the public, and if we believe him alive at the time the autobiography was published we must hold him guilty of deception and trickery. And to his thousands of friends and admirers, who were so deeply pained at the premature publication of the autobiography, my discovery of his death prior to its appearance will come as glad tidings and welcome relief.

I have already made some reference to the freedom from suspicion with which the public accepts the impersonator for Mark Twain himself; and yet, even a superficial view ought to show plainly that he is an impostor. Of late years there have been frequent charges, all unsubstantiated it is true, but nevertheless widely circulated, that Mrs. Eddy's life is being lived by a clever substitute. I incline to the belief that this claim was concocted by the conspirators to divert attention from the actual impersonation of Mark Twain which they were carrying on. If it is the old cry of "Stop Thief," it is not the first time that ruse has proven successful. The personality of the present Mark Twain convinces any thoughtful man that he is bogus. True, he possesses certain physical resemblances to the Mark Twain we knew—notably the long, bushy, white hair. But the resemblance does not extend beyond the physical appearance. The old Mark Twain was profoundly profane; the new Mark Twain uses language that requires no expurgation for Sunday-school purposes. The old Mark Twain was notoriously indifferent about his dress; the new Mark Twain is a Beau Brummel, who, with his white suits, even to evening dress, is the acknowledged leader of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fashion. The old Mark Twain expressed himself in all of his writings in terms of the river craft; the new Mark Twain uses the language of the drawing-room, not of the steamboat deck. The old Mark Twain hobnobbed with river men and luckless Western miners; the new Mark Twain is the boon companion of captains of finance and millionaires are his playfellows. Is further illustration necessary to show that this person, whoever he may be, is not the Mark Twain we have known for fifty years?

But I attach little importance, after all, to the personality of the man; my most conclusive evidence that Mark Twain is no more I find in the books that bear his name. "By their fruits ye shall know them." If the dead can do no wrong, likewise can they write no books. Since 1906 two books by Mark Twain have appeared—"Christian Science" and "Is Shakespeare Dead?" Even with his name on the title-page, it must have taxed the credulity of the most unsuspecting to accept Mark Twain as the author of these works. Instead of the fanciful stories or delightfully humorous travesties that Mark Twain produced during his forty years of writing, we have here a ponderous theological argument and a profound study of the Baconian controversy. If the long series of Gilbert's comic operas had been followed, in his declining years, by the publication, under his name, of a treatise on Hindu philosophy, would we not have rightly doubted the asserted authorship and felt certain that the publisher was perpetrating a joke? But not only the subject-matter of the later Mark Twain books, but their style, give the lie to their alleged authorship. We look in vain for the delicious humor, the unexpected play of imagination, with which his authentic works abound. The forced funny story, the occasional humorous remark, so evidently dragged in by the heels, indicate an obvious imitation rather than the genuineness of Mark Twain's authorship.

Of "Christian Science," I need only say that it is a learned and weighty discussion of Mrs. Eddy's favorite religion. Convincing, scientific, profoundly learned, I admit; written by the author of "Huckleberry Finn," never! I doubt whether Mark Twain could have written "Christian Science" if he had wanted to; that he would not have wanted to I am sure.

But the most convincing proof is found in the latest book bearing his name, "Is Shakespeare Dead?" which appeared in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

April of this year. Emboldened by their success and no longer fearful of detection, the publishers have exhibited the extreme of recklessness in putting Mark Twain's name to this work. The author sought to lend some probability to this claim by sprinkling throughout the book an air of forced facetiousness, and inserting in its pages inappropriate allusions to Mark Twain's early life in Missouri and on the Mississippi River. This work could never have been written by the Mark Twain that we knew. Perhaps his famous remark, that Shakespeare's works were not written by Shakespeare, but by another gentleman of the same name, might be equally true of this book. But the author of "Tom Sawyer" is not the author of "Is Shakespeare Dead?" It is a scholarly work of profound erudition, and has been accepted by critics as the final word on the Baconian controversy. No Shakespearite after reading it can longer cling to the Stratford fallacy. The author reasons logically that the writer of the plays could not have been Shakespeare, because they exhibit an intimate knowledge of the technicalities of the law, and there is no evidence that Shakespeare, the actor, had at any time the leisure to acquire legal lore. Now, in like manner, I contend that the author of "Is Shakespeare Dead?" was the greatest Shakespearian student that ever lived. Nothing but a lifetime of study could have given such complete mastery over the subject. The author displays greater knowledge of his subject than such scholars as Dowden and Furness, who have devoted their lives to the study of Shakespeare. Do the known facts about Mark Twain's life give any evidence that he could have been this profound Shakespearian scholar? On the contrary, they make it positive that he was not. We know that Mark Twain acquired little learning and less literature in the few years he attended school. We know that he spent the early years of his life busily occupied in ways that left no time for soaring to the topmost heights of scholarship; that he was a river pilot and a printer, a gold miner and a reporter on Western papers. We know that in his later years his whole time was given to writing humorous books and making after-dinner speeches; that his final years were spent in travelling abroad, writing more books and making more after-dinner speeches. Truly, a busy life with little time for acquiring extensive learning, and I challenge any who disagree with me to point to a single period of that active life when leisure could

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

have been found to acquire the erudition so profoundly displayed in this work on Shakespeare. Judged by the known facts of his life, not by what we might assume they might have been—Mark Twain could not have written "Is Shakespeare Dead?" We can more easily believe that the unlettered son of a Stratford butcher wrote the plays that bear the name of Shakespeare than that the uneducated Mississippi River pilot could have acquired the intimate knowledge of the Baconian question displayed in that work.

Another argument successfully used by Baconians is suggested by the same work. In "Is Shakespeare Dead?" Macaulay's "Essay on Bacon" is so frequently quoted that we may assume that it was well known to the writer. I have examined all available data concerning Mark Twain, from the autobiography itself to the merest magazine reference, and I find no indication that he ever read or even knew of Macaulay's Essay. In the absence of any affirmative statement anywhere to that effect, we may properly conclude that he had not read it. It follows then that Mark Twain could not have been the author of "Is Shakespeare Dead?"

If not Mark Twain, then who is the author? the curious will doubtless ask. Just as some anti-Shakespearians are satisfied when they convince us that Shakespeare was not the author of the plays and leave the identity of the real author in doubt, so I might content myself with proving that Mark Twain did not write "Christian Science" and "Is Shakespeare Dead?" without attempting to strip the mask from the writer who has borrowed his name. But the identity of the author is so evident that the reader has probably already guessed it. Applying the principles of deductive ratiocination, made popular by Sherlock Holmes, we know that the real author is a writer unhampered by any sense of humor. He combines a mastery of all subjects of human knowledge with a complete understanding of all religions. He possesses the commercial instinct which makes him an author for revenue only. He is willing to write as the dead for the living there is in it. He is an erudite Shakespearian scholar and has read Macaulay's Essay on Bacon. Jealousy of literary honors has made him the arch enemy of Mrs. Eddy. To enumerate these essential attributes is to name the author. Other writers may lay claim to some of the qualifications; he alone possesses

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

them all. The name springs instinctively to the lips—Elbert Hubbard.

But any lingering doubt of the correctness of the author's identification is dispelled by the existence of a cryptogram in the works themselves. We know now that Lord Bacon, with infinite labor, wove his name in cipher into the plays which he did not care enough about to claim. So I surmised that Elbert Hubbard, prevented by his arrangement with the publishers from acknowledging the Mark Twain books, would profit by Bacon's ingenuity and likewise reveal his authorship to the elect by similar tortuous methods. But with limited leisure for investigation, I was at a loss how to go about the search for the cipher. Fortunately at this time a friend placed in my hands an exhaustive work just published by William Stone Booth entitled "Some Anacrostic Signatures of Francis Bacon" (Houghton, Mifflin Company, 1909). After reading that work, the discovery of the Hubbard cipher became easy. The author (page 38) points out that the proper place to look for a cipher is at some striking page of the book, one that would readily fasten itself in the author's memory. So I took up "Is Shakespeare Dead?" and turned with confidence to page 23. How to find the cipher that existed there was the next problem. Again Mr. Booth came to my rescue, and I learned (page 36) that you may read the desired anacrostic by selecting from the text the necessary letters, reading from right to left on either the terminal, initial or any letters of any words. I elected to read on any letter of the text and was promptly rewarded with the following anacrostic signature of Elbert Hubbard. Here is the passage exactly as it occurs at page 23 of the book in question, except that I have put the anacrostic letters in capitals to facilitate the reading of the cipher:

"And so on and so on. We sEt down five known facts by themseLves on a piece of paper and numBered it 'page 1'; thEn on fifteen hundred other pieces of papeR we set down the 'conjectures,' and 'supposiTions,' and 'maybes,' and 'perHapses,' and 'doubtlesses,' and 'rUmors,' and 'guesses,' and 'probaBilities,' and 'likelihoods,' and 'we Are permitted to thinks,' and 'we are waRranted in believings,' and 'might have beens,' and 'coulD have beens,' and 'must have beens,' and 'unquestionablys,' and 'without a shadow of doubts'—and behold!"

The supercritical may direct attention to the fact that the "Hubard" of this signature is minus one "b," but if Lord

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Bacon spelled his name in sixty different ways in Shakespeare's plays, as Mr. Booth has proven, surely Elbert Hubbard may be permitted, for the purpose of his anacrostic signature, to occasionally drop a "b" from his name. Convinced by this great discovery that the author's name was actually revealed by a cipher, I turned my attention to "Christian Science" and by patient investigation discovered many anacrostic signatures in that book also.

I have now demonstrated beyond all possible doubt that Mark Twain is dead, and that Elbert Hubbard is the author of the books that have appeared since his death. Of course my statement will be emphatically denied by the bogus Mark Twain. But such denial should not shake any one's belief in the facts I have proven. Even in a court of law the denials of an interested party are regarded with suspicion. They are never permitted to prevail over the statements of a disinterested witness. I can have no possible self-interest to serve in proclaiming Mark Twain's death; the strongest possible motive, namely, self-preservation as Mark Twain, prompts denial from the impostor. Will any unbiased reader accept the denial of the most interested party in preference to my disinterested statement?

Besides, any such denial, rightly viewed, is in itself proof that Mark Twain is no more. It will be recalled that a few years ago, while the real Mark Twain was living abroad, a rumor of his death was circulated in this country, and when a reporter went to him for a denial he modestly contented himself with saying that the report was slightly exaggerated. No emphatic refutation, no denial supported by an oath! If Mark Twain answered a mere vague rumor of his death with the statement that it was a slight exaggeration, would he, if living to-day, deny the positive statement of his death, supported as it is by incontrovertible proof? At the most, he might express some doubt as to the finality of the evidence and ask for further time to consider it. And so any emphatic denial can come only from an impostor and is proof that Mark Twain is no more. If, however, the bogus Mark Twain meets this exposure by silence, it must be construed as an admission of his guilt. The conclusion, therefore, is the same whether he denies my statement or fails to deny it, *Mark Twain is dead.*

EUGENE H. ANGERT.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

HAVE WE MISLAID A VALUABLE POSSESSION?

BY HON. M. E. CLAPP, U. S. SENATOR.

THERE seems to be a recrudescence of interest in the political status of the Isle of Pines. Distractions of stirring events throughout the world during the past five years, and the absorption of the mind of the American people in our own partisan discussions, have withdrawn our attention from the situation of many of our worthy fellow countrymen who migrated to or invested their money in an attractive tropical dependency, then generally held to be United States territory, and who now feel that they have been abandoned by their Government as well as forgotten by their compatriots.

Whether or not we unreservedly endorse all the legal contentions put forth by these settlers and investors, we will readily sympathize with them in the unfortunate position of involuntary expatriation which they have been forced to assume. And we can scarcely refrain from encouraging any reasonable proposition that may be suggested for their relief.

The Isle of Pines lies off the southwest coast of Cuba and is alone more extensive than all the other thirteen hundred isles and islets strewn around the Cuban seaboard. Geographically, this island is no more a part of Cuba than the Danish Island of St. Thomas is a part of Porto Rico. The Isle of Pines is from thirty-eight to sixty miles from Cuba, according as the distance is measured to the inner or outer part of the bay of the larger island. In former times the Isle of Pines was not included in the Spanish Administration of Cuba. It is fair to say, therefore, that neither politically nor geographically is it a part of Cuba. Miles of sea separate them and nothing but the recent political status serves to connect them.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The area of the Isle of Pines is about one thousand square miles and its population about four thousand. This area is about equal to that of the State of Rhode Island with a population of 475,000. The island lies seven hundred and thirty miles north by west of Colon, the entrance to the Panama Canal; two hundred and thirty miles east of the nearest port of Yucatan, Mexico; three hundred and seventy miles northwest of Jamaica and three hundred and fifty miles from Tampa, Florida, *viâ* Batabano and Havana.

In general the surface of the Isle of Pines is a plateau of fifty to one hundred feet above the sea-level, broken by ridges of hills or cliffs that project abruptly above the general surface. The two mountain ridges at the northern end reach an elevation of about fifteen hundred feet and are composed of limestone and marble. The other ridges in the centre are much lower, less precipitous and formed of gray sandstone, red rock and gravel containing iron.

The climate of the Isle of Pines is traditionally the most salubrious of the Antilles. Yellow fever, which has repeatedly scourged Cuba, is there unknown. Even in the darkest days of Spanish control no epidemic ever visited its shores. Save for the narrow swamp of Lanier, which nearly divides the southern third into a separate body, the island is high and dry. Ninety per cent. of the land surface is adapted to the raising of the most valuable tropical products. Settlers from any part of the United States require no acclimatization.

The shallowness of the surrounding water has been described as a disadvantage, but the fact, as borne out by marine charts, shows a much deeper channel along the north shore of the island than on the opposite coast of Cuba.

Abundant supplies of the purest water are readily obtainable. The winds coming from the sea and passing over the pine forests are described as gentle and invigorating. The range of temperature between summer and winter rarely exceeds a mean of eleven degrees.

The mineral springs for which the island has a world-wide reputation, judged from official reports, are remarkable, especially in pulmonary, rheumatic and throat affections.

Already American citizens have improved thousands of acres of the fertile land of the interior, planting orange, grapefruit

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and lemon groves and pineapple orchards, which are beginning to yield abundantly.

The island, located as it is with relation to the Caribbean Sea and the Gulf of Mexico, is of immense strategic importance to the United States. It is, in a sense, the key to both those bodies of water and would form an admirable outpost as a guard to the mouth of the Panama Canal. The Bay of Siguanea, opening from the western end of the Isle of Pines, is an extensive sheet of water fifteen miles in width by over twenty in length and contains a depth of from twenty-two to thirty-five feet. By dredging a short channel through the sand-bar to the north of Point Frances this bay will be available for vessels of deep draught, and contains several sites eminently suitable for coaling-stations. It could thus be made into a safe and commodious harbor large enough to float the navy of any nation, and of incalculable value to the United States in case of a foreign war threatening the security of the eastern outlet of the Panama Canal at Colon.

On the strength of assurances officially made by responsible officers of the United States Government ten or more years ago, nearly three thousand Americans have become interested as residents or property-owners in the Isle of Pines. At least nine-tenths of the land of the island is now owned by citizens of the United States under titles bought in good faith and paid for to the Cuban and Spanish owners. They have built their homes there, established churches, schools, banks, newspapers, transportation lines and all the adjuncts of American civilization. The conditions which have prevailed in the island for hundreds of years, under Spanish rule, would, with favorable conditions, be mitigated by American ownership. Our people show both a willingness and a capacity for developing its splendid resources, and they feel that they are entitled to encouragement by the maintenance of American sovereignty, instead of enduring prostration and loss through expatriation to an alien flag.

Our fellow citizens have spent their money in the purchase of farms, have moved their families thereto, built their homes, and endured all the discomforts of pioneering, with the distinct understanding, based on their interpretation of the language of the treaty and on official assurances from our Government, that they were entitled to, and would receive, the protection of the American flag. They now find themselves abandoned by their Gov-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ernment and subjected to the rule of foreigners whose history, traditions and policies are altogether different from any to which they have been accustomed.

It will be interesting to inquire how this unfortunate condition has come about.

Article II of the Treaty of Paris which terminated the war of 1898 between the United States and Spain contains these words:

"Spain cedes to the United States the Island of Porto Rico and other islands now under Spanish sovereignty in the West Indies."

The language here used is entirely different from that employed in the same treaty with reference to Cuba, which was that "Spain relinquishes all claim to sovereignty or title." The expression "other islands" was held by the United States Government to include the Isle of Pines. That such was the understanding of the American Commissioners who negotiated the treaty has been, it is stated, specifically admitted by at least two of the Commissioners, Senators Cushman K. Davis and William P. Frye. This is verified by the contention of a Spanish Commissioner at the time the treaty was negotiated, who said:

"They [the United States] did claim sovereignty over the latter [Porto Rico] and over the other islands surrounding Cuba, which will render impossible the independence of the latter, which will always have it at their mercy through their control over the island, which enclose it like a band of iron."

The contention of Cuba and of those who sustain her position is that the Isle of Pines was a part of Cuba and was not intended to be included in the "other islands" expressly ceded to the United States by the treaty with Spain.

This dispute as to the sovereignty of the island has never been adjusted between Cuba and the United States. The Government of Cuba, by the act of its creation through the law of Congress known as the Platt Amendment, was excluded from jurisdiction over the Isle of Pines by the following provision:

"VI. That the Isle of Pines shall be omitted from the proposed constitutional boundaries of Cuba, the title thereto being left to future adjustment by treaty."

As to what was meant by the "adjustment" of the jurisdiction we are left in doubt. Senator O. H. Platt, of Connecti-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cut, the author of this amendment, seems never to have intended a sale, surrender or relinquishment of jurisdiction, but made this provision for a final amicable settlement such as would be to the best interests of all concerned. In a letter dated November 5th, 1902, Mr. Platt said:

"I inserted a clause to the effect that the title should be subject of treaty negotiations. I feel that it is of the utmost importance that it shall be ours. It will give us the most advantageous point from which to defend the entrance of the Isthmian Canal. I supposed, when I provided that it should be the subject of treaty negotiations, that unless we could satisfy the Cuban Government that it passed to us in the Cession it would come to us by purchase, and that is still my belief."

After the Spanish War, President McKinley directed the United States Land Commissioner to place the Isle of Pines upon the official map as United States territory. This was done, and the map was issued with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior in 1899. These maps were so published until 1904, with the Isle of Pines plainly indicated thereon as United States territory, the same as Porto Rico and entirely different from Cuba. The maps were displayed upon the Isle of Pines and in every State in the Union. They were everywhere recognized as official and authentic. President McKinley in reply to an inquiry as to the status of the Isle of Pines made by Mr. Tichenor said: "There is no question about it; the Isle of Pines was ceded to the United States by Spain and it belongs to us."

In 1900 the Assistant Secretary of War, replying to inquiries as to the status of the island, said: "You are advised that the Isle of Pines was ceded by Spain to the United States. It is, therefore, a part of our territory." It is alleged on behalf of the settlers and investors from the United States that for a long period every department of our Government when called upon expressed the same opinion.

It seems to be well established that for several years at this period the United States Government was presenting an attractive picture to the people which was calculated to impress them with the conviction that the Isle of Pines was an inviting place of residence. Our Government has seldom prepared such alluring invitations to the American people for colonizing any of its possessions, even on the Western frontier. We have made no other such a propaganda.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Later, however, and under another national administration, a treaty was made between the United States and Cuba by which for certain considerations we surrendered the Isle of Pines, so far as the executive authorities were authorized to do so. This treaty failed of confirmation by the Senate and expired by limitation.

Another treaty signed March 2nd, 1904, for the adjustment of the title to the jurisdiction of the Isle of Pines contained these stipulations:

"Article I. The United States of America relinquishes in favor of the Republic of Cuba all title and claim to the Island of Pines situated in the Caribbean Sea near the southwestern part of the Island of Cuba, which has been or may be made in virtue of Articles I and II of the Treaty of Peace between the United States and Spain signed at Paris, December 10th, 1898."

Article III provides that Americans in the Isle of Pines shall "be subject to such laws as are applicable to other foreigners."

This treaty was made indefinite as to period of ratification and is still pending before the Senate of the United States. When the treaty was under negotiation at Havana it is claimed, on behalf of the American settlers and investors in the Isle of Pines, that they were assured the treaty would contain several provisions safeguarding American interests. These provisions related to the establishment of a satisfactory form of insular government; special judicial tribunals; the opening of a port of entry on the island; the opening of land records; and the establishment of an American school. None of these stipulations appear in the treaty, but Americans are classed with "other foreigners." The failure to incorporate them has stimulated a loud complaint, on the part of Americans interested, that they have been totally abandoned by their Government.

This treaty was referred by the Senate to its Committee on Foreign Relations, which, on February 1st, 1906, made a majority report submitted by Senator Foraker of Ohio recommending the ratification of the treaty, and a minority report submitted by Senator Morgan of Alabama strongly protesting against such ratification. Both the majority and the minority reports, with the exhibits pertaining thereto, were printed in a volume of 277 pages as Senate Document No. 205, Fifty-ninth Congress, first session. This document contains all the arguments and claims put forth on both sides of the question, as well as a vast amount

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of valuable information concerning the island, its history, resources, etc.

Mr. Foraker's report sustained the contention of the Cubans that the island is and ought to be a part of their territory and subject to their jurisdiction.

Mr. Morgan's report strongly maintains the opposite of this conclusion; endorses the claim of the Americans in the Isle of Pines that they of right ought to be under the jurisdiction of the Government of the United States, and that to abandon them to Cuba against their will is a gross injustice. One of the propositions of Senator Morgan's very able report is thus stated:

"If the United States has no title to the Isle of Pines it cannot have a lawful claim of title under the Platt Amendment, which can be surrendered for a consideration, and that part of the treaty should be stricken from the text; or, if it has a title to the Isle of Pines, the President and the Senate cannot sell the island to Cuba—that can only be done by act of Congress."

The Morgan report further alleges that the Isle of Pines was never an integral part or a province of Cuba, but only a municipal appendage of one province and a judicial appendage of another one. It contends that "if the United States, as sovereign, should cede or sell the title to the Isle of Pines to Cuba, it will thereby create an ownership in the Republic of Cuba that never existed in Cuba as a Spanish department, and a title that is derived solely from the political sovereignty of the United States."

The strong presentation of the case for the American residents of the island in Senator Morgan's minority report has sufficed to prevent the ratification of the treaty for more than three years, and the prospects for its future ratification seem very doubtful. Meantime, however, the island has been turned over to the Cuban Government, which now exercises jurisdiction over citizens of the United States, who went there supposing it to be American territory, and over property rights, which cover all of value there.

The present contention of the Americans is that inasmuch as the Platt Amendment and the Cuban constitution leave it open to adjustment, there is no more reason why Cuba should have possession of the island pending that adjustment than the United States. Furthermore, they assert that, having settled in the Isle of Pines under assurances of President McKinley and the heads of departments of the United States Government, they are en-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

titled to fair consideration on the equities of the case regardless of strict legal technicalities.

The present situation on the island is thus seen to be eminently unsatisfactory. The Americans, having invested and settled there under a misapprehension, to say the least, of the intentions of the United States Government as to title and jurisdiction, are naturally very restless over the condition in which they find themselves. Manifestly it is the plain duty of our Government to assist them in every practicable and reasonable way.

It is hoped that some form of compromise may be devised whereby the interests of our people in the Isle of Pines may be adequately protected, whereby the jurisdiction over the island may be settled according to their understanding of the original intention, while at the same time the Government of Cuba, which is our ward and protégé, may be spared any unnecessary humiliation through even an appearance of injustice to them. Senator Morgan said, in his report: "These people were certainly misled by their confidence in the justice of their Government that it would maintain the clear meaning of the Platt Amendment and the Treaty of Paris." Hon. Elihu Root, now Senator from New York, who was Secretary of War in 1903, and who later, as Secretary of State, negotiated the treaty which is now pending, wrote December 18th, 1903, as follows:

> "I think that the Americans who settled in the island could not be expected to know whether it was a part of the duty of an Assistant Secretary of War to decide or make representations about the title of the island, and that they have a strong equitable claim to have our Government take special pains to see that their rights are protected."

The equities of the Americans who removed to and invested in the Isle of Pines are thus officially recognized. Every reasonable man must acknowledge the force of this recognition, and American public sentiment would undoubtedly sustain the present Administration in taking any proper measures for their protection and relief. This Government cannot afford to rest under the imputation of having abandoned its enterprising citizens, who, relying on what they supposed were authentic official assurances, illustrated the American spirit of enterprise by embarking in schemes which looked to the development and settlement of United States territory.

M. E. Clapp.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE ANOMALOUS POSITION OF THE UNMARRIED WOMAN.

BY CAROLYN SHIPMAN.

IN Mr. Henry James' novel "The Golden Bowl," the Prince says to Charlotte Stant:

"'I've been thinking it all the while so probable, you know, that you would have seen your way to marrying—some good, kind, clever, rich American.'

"'I tried every one I came across,' was her reply. 'No one would have me. . . . Existence, you know, all the same, doesn't depend on that. I mean,' she smiled, 'on having caught a husband.'

"'Oh—existence!' the Prince vaguely commented.

"'You think I ought to argue for more than mere existence?' she asked. 'I don't see why *my* existence—even reduced as much as you like to being merely mine—should be so impossible. There are things, of sorts, I should be able to have—things I should be able to be. The position of a single woman to-day is very favorable, you know.'

"'Favorable to what?'

"'Why, just *to* existence—which may contain, after all, in one way and another, so much. It may contain, at the worst, even affections; affections, in fact, quite particularly; fixed, that is, on one's friends. . . .'

"To which the Prince replied, in summing the matter up: 'My dear friend, it's always a question of doing the best for one's self one can—without injury to others. . . . I venture, therefore, to repeat my hope that you'll marry some capital fellow; and also to repeat my belief that such a marriage will be more favorable to you, as you call it, than even the spirit of the age.'"

Such, in general and in brief, is the attitude of the world towards the unmarried woman. From her point of view, existence does not necessarily depend upon marriage; from the world's, and that of her friends, it should so depend, in order that she may "do the best for herself," or "fulfil her destiny," or "have some one to protect her," as the case may be. She is reasoned with, urged, and even ominously warned of the time, fast ap-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

proaching, when her charms will fade, and she will be passed by of men for lineaments more youthful and attractions less mature. She is told that it were better to marry without the romantic love hoped for when she was younger, than not to marry at all; better to wed "solid respectability and sterling worth," and so acquire an acknowledged position in the social fabric, than to eat her heart out in waiting for an ideal.

Not only is she reasoned with and cajoled, but she is also tricked into meeting possible *partis*. She is put on the defensive by comments (as a rule made by married women) skilfully conveyed by these same solicitous friends: "Why, do you suppose, such an attractive woman has never married? She would make an admirable wife." And she wisely curbs her desire to reply in a manner not altogether complimentary to the husbands of the speculative ladies.

There is no doubt that the widened sphere of opportunity for American women furnishes the single woman with a position "very favorable to existence," as Charlotte Stant put it. She has freedom to work, no responsibility of household duties and children, her own money if she earns her living, the delights of travel —in short, she can live her own life to the limit of ambition, and develop all of her latent powers. A pleasant picture, surely, and one to tempt aspiring womanhood. The charm of a latch-key and the independence it implies, the comfort of one's club or a cozy apartment, the pleasure of mingling with men and women on a plane of business equality, and the accompanying contact with the world which is denied to the "protected woman," are considerations not to be lightly dismissed. Such experiences inoculate the blood, and the fever appears again at intervals even after that life has been left behind.

Such is the "spirit of the age," as the Prince expressed it. What is the reverse side of the medal?

Let us leave out of consideration the unemployed single women occupied only with "affections quite particularly fixed on their friends," or waiting for marriage as most idle unmarried women secretly are, and speak only of the employed. Perhaps the greatest number of employed single women are engaged in teaching; therefore a teacher's life may be regarded as typical.

In a small town a teacher has little pay, with corresponding low cost of living, hard work, very little leisure, no theatres or

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

concerts worth considering if she knows the best, few temptations to spend money, but a position as a social being (not a teacher) if education is held in repute in the town. This advantage depends for its value on the personnel of the society. If the "high school" or "academy" is regarded as a centre, the town is likely to contain some people worth knowing; otherwise the woman is thrown on her own resources and is regarded merely as "a teacher"—*i.e.*, a machine for pumping knowledge into children.

A teacher in a public school of a large city has practically no social position *per se*. Whatever life she has outside of her work is created by her own efforts, and for these she has little leisure. A private-school teacher in a large city may be well paid, but she works hard, has little time to herself because of outside duties; and, if she has no social connection with the city through friends, when she is invited out, it is as "Julia's teacher," to discuss with Julia's parents over the dinner-table Julia's progress in history or what not. Other social occasions (aside from her intercourse with fellow teachers and pupils) are school receptions, when Julia's parents are present to ask her how she likes teaching.

A college teacher's fate is more enviable; but here again the work is very hard, and the great disadvantage is the constant feminine atmosphere, only relieved to a slight degree by the masculine presence, and that, possibly, not of one's choosing. Presidents, deans, and women of similar educational positions have more power and influence, in proportion as they are fewer in number, and consequent increase of social attachment.

On the whole, however, the average teacher's life is one of social detachment, hard, nerve-exhausting, and little appreciated by those to whom her services are given—and, moreover, poorly, often wretchedly, paid.

Perhaps the most enviable career for a single woman is the life of a successful writer, editor, or productive (not studying) artist—*e.g.*, singer or painter, in a city. Such a woman has the advantage of congenial work and friends, a large enough bank account for a home and travel, for theatre and concerts. During the most marriageable age—from twenty-five to thirty years—the zest for work and advancement is so great that other thoughts are likely to be crowded out. The joy of living is apparently at its height.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

But, after the thirtieth year is passed, when ambition has been to a large extent gratified, and the appetite for freedom is sated; when her position is secure, and her work routine; when her women friends marry one by one and she is left alone, there comes a time when she grows introspective. "What is the aim of it all? For what and for whom am I living?" she asks herself. Then, no matter how many friends she has, a great loneliness settles down upon her—sometimes so oppressive as almost to cause physical heartache—and she feels her detachment from the general scheme of things.

Particularly is this true on holidays and summer Sundays, if she is forced to be in town. Her married friends have their Christmas plans involving families. She may be—she probably is—invited to join them, but she is an outsider. If she has a woman friend similarly placed, they perhaps dine together and go to the play on Christmas, but she realizes that they are two lonely women trying to keep up a brave front. "Holidays are soon over," you may reason. Yes, but they return, and there is always an undercurrent of that haunting loneliness ready to spring up unexpectedly in a woman's heart. Nothing is more painful or hard to bear for a sensitive woman than the kind of loneliness that may overtake her at any turn if she is living a detached life. Married women with family cares or "protected" women with too much leisure often envy the independent life of the self-supporting woman. But they see only the pleasant side. There is another; and the envied one would, more often than most people know, exchange lots with the envier. After a woman has passed her thirtieth year, she is very likely to tire of independence and to wish for guidance and advice. The argument that she is "as free as a man" has been satisfactorily proved to be sophistry. She learns that she is half man and half woman, deprived of the advantages of a wife, with the burdens of a man, but not his privileges. For example, if she is restless and lonely at night, she cannot go to the play in solitary fashion, like a man; she might do so in Boston, but she could not in New York and feel quite comfortable, if she were young. She must sit at home and try to divert her mind if no companionship is available. She has not even man's solace of a cigar and a stroll. Propriety forbids solitary walks for ladies after dark!

This matter of independence for a woman who has always known

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

it is a vital one in marriage, and not to be trippingly disposed of. It looms large when all the connotations of the word are considered: independence in conduct, thought, time and money. Probably only women unhappily married would wish as fervently as Diana of the Crossways for "freedom to breathe, gaze, climb, grow with the grasses, fly with the clouds, to muse, to sing, to be an unclaimed self." Not every woman has her jealous, exacting husband. But even so, the wish to be "an unclaimed self" unconsciously asserts itself at times; the occasional tendency to eat our cake and try to keep it is manifest in us all. Independence is the single woman's greatest boon, and that very possession helps to detach her from the social fabric.

The implied ingenuousness of the unmarried woman may become a source of irritation. The world assumes much the same attitude towards her that some mothers take towards their five-year-old children: they adjudge them too inexperienced to have observed life, forgetting their own early years, when deep impressions gave instinctive knowledge. Because a woman is unmarried, the world treats her like a veritable *ingénue;* no matter how much experience and observation of life she has had, her intuition and imagination and reason count for nothing against the claims of a chit of twenty summers just fresh from her marriage vows, who can "chaperon" her, forsooth! This state of things would be annoying were it not so laughable! It becomes a real disadvantage when used as an argument to prevent a woman from living alone. What age must an unmarried woman have reached before Society will allow her to chaperon herself?

Anthony Trollope's view of women expressed on the occasion of Eleanor Bold's marriage to Mr. Arabin, that they are clinging vines which creep along the earth until they find a tower up which to climb, is an obsolete metaphor. Especially is this supineness untrue in the twentieth century. Women are not only free, but able to stand alone. The strongest, most intellectual woman, however, needs companionship and the love of one particular individual. The classic example is George Eliot, whose "mind of a man" was housed in a woman's body pathetically dependent upon protection and love. This fact satisfactorily explains the reason for her marriage to Mr. Cross. If she had been less feminine, her last days would have been spent in mourning her lost companion.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Miss Repplier, in her admirable defence of the Spinster, asks:

"What if she is not in the least wistful, and never casts longing looks at her sister-in-law's babies, nor strains them passionately to her heart, nor deems it a privilege to nurse her nephews through whooping-cough and measles, nor offers herself in any fashion as a holocaust upon other people's domestic altars? What if, holding her life in her two hands, and knowing it to be her only real possession, she disposes of it in the way she feels will give her most content, swimming smoothly in the stream of her own nature, and clearly aware that happiness lies in the development of her individual tastes and acquirements? . . . Marriage is a delightful thing; but it is not, and never can be, a duty."

True! But the woman who does not at some time of her life think of marriage as a possibility or a desideratum is either too masculine for such a desire (*i.e.*, abnormal), too confirmed a spinster in her fastidiousness or habits of single life, or is in the enjoyment of a career artistic, literary or otherwise professional which is sufficiently productive of satisfaction to compensate for the lack of married companionship. Probably, if the truth were confessed, the majority of unmarried women over thirty years of age have the normal desire to be married. A genius, like Rosa Bonheur, may live a life apart in an altitude of creation and contemplation, where human companionship is unnecessary except at intervals; but it is the exceptional woman who does not secretly cherish the hope or expectation of marriage. Even the most unlikely entertains the idea.

The maternal instinct is the motive power for marriage with most women, and many unmarried women even long for children without the necessity of a husband! The world is inclined to think a wife's existence unjustified if she has no progeny, like the old man who looked at Mrs. Carlyle in astonishment upon her confession that she was childless, and exclaimed, "What have you been doing all these years?"

The desire of the average educated woman who marries in these days is for companionship. Miss Repplier lays too much stress upon maternity, which is only incidental in such a marriage. There are interests, emotions, obligations, and ambitions unconnected with the rearing of children, as she protests. But matrimony does not necessarily imply the rearing of children, despite the misleading and officious pronunciamento of the author of the phrase "race suicide." By whose dictum does a woman "owe it

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to the race" to have children if she does not desire them? She did not ask to be brought into the world, neither did her arrival imply a contract to bear children as likely to be unthankful as thankful for "the boon of life." If the law of the survival of the fittest is not to become utterly extinct, the supply of unwelcome children should be lessened, for the antagonism of the parents will surely crop out in the progeny in some mental or moral twist.

There is a well-worn truism suggesting sour grapes: Riches do not bring happiness. The irritated reply to such pseudo-philosophy might be: No, but they help to soften sorrow and relieve unhappiness as poverty does not. Better to be unhappy and rich than unhappy and poor.

So with marriage. To the average person, life is a gamble at best, and marriage a lottery; but the calculation of chances favors greater happiness to the married than to the unmarried woman, because of the possibility of completer, fuller life. Hume left money to be spent on masses for his soul, agnostic that he was, on the chance that the Catholic religion might prove to be the true one. In the same manner a woman past forty years of age who has never been in love, might better take the chances with a man whom she can respect and who is her equal in refinement and social position, and is congenial to her, than never to marry at all. It is safe to say that no woman meets her "ideal." He is a creature of moonbeams and sawdust constructed by youthful fancy. But she should look for certain traits in a man—courage, honor, sincerity, generosity, tenderness, sympathy—above all, loyalty, which are good to live with day after day and day after day, "for richer, for poorer, in sickness and in health"—qualities which endure and command respect and form the only true foundation for lasting love, when the passion of youth and early love is spent.

I might quote Tennyson's "Princess," but I will not! Neither will I mention Woman's Sphere. My brief is for companionship, for married *camaraderie*. The plea is not sentimental; it is social, practical, even precautionary, like taking out an insurance policy against certain death! Women are bound to have unhappiness in whatever their sphere. Why not have some one to share it, a congenial travelling companion with whom to work and play, to be sad or gay? "To hold back the hand from the rose

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

because of the thorn" is to miss the exhilaration of an adventure which is just as likely to be successful as the opposite. The woman who hesitates is left behind.

But, some one argues, suppose the women willing to marry. Where are the men? In one small Eastern town of which I know, of the twenty-five hundred souls, sixty are women far past the marriageable age, and there are numbers of marriageable girls. In New England the proportion of single women is even more discouraging. Whom shall they marry? The number of eligible men decreases as women advance in age—no woman of forty wants a crusty old bachelor of fifty, and the men most attractive to women are already married.

The average man will not ask a woman in marriage unless he can support her in the manner to which she is accustomed. With the increasing cost of living, the problem grows in seriousness. The material side of marriage is so emphasized that the question now asked when a woman marries is not, "What is her husband's character? Is he honorable, courageous, generous, loyal, worthy to be the father of children?" The question is, How much money is he worth? Yet there exist fine women who would "scrub the floor for him" if they could find the right man, as I recently heard a woman say who lives in independent ease. Doubtless there are many Dianas of the Crossways whose Thomas Redworths would not need to let the world go wrong for fear of lack of money. But the Redworth type of man has fixed ideas of what is due to a woman and he is difficult to convince.

Where lies the trouble? Perhaps in education and the present over-emphasis of money. Any system of education for women is defective which ignores wifehood and motherhood—nay, which does not tacitly have these ends in view. Not that women are incapable of other things, but that in the long run they will presumptively find their truest, completest happiness in the married state. I contend that the woman who is not a vital part of the social organism and the centre of a home revolving around her, occupies an anomalous position. She is part of a world, social or economic, a world of theories and abstract principles, but not of *the* world of life-giving forces, the world of actual creation of which the family (the foundation of the state) is the unit. She is like the fringe of a shawl, which is not the texture; belonging to it as an accompaniment, but not necessary.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"But some one must teach," we hear. "Some one must perform the duties now accomplished by wage-earning women. Who would be left to work if all women became wives and mothers?"

Who did the work before women entered the field in such numbers? Was there not then as much sound and profitable education as now? Why this sudden necessity for women to earn money when heretofore the fathers and brothers and husbands supported them? How much happier are the restless women of the present day than their grandmothers and great-grandmothers who did not compete with men along industrial lines? How much finer, more unselfish and more lovable men and women are we producing as the result of this social and economic restlessness? It is well for every woman to be able to earn her own living, but do we not carry it too far?

The question is merely of the greatest final happiness and good. No one will deny that we all desire happiness. What will be the ultimate end if the education of women tends to make them unmarried wage-earners, and if money is to be the chief requisite for marriage? A society of spinsters and clubmen, and the "race-suicide" theory disproved (as it now is) by the very class of people least fitted to perpetuate their species, the ignorant and vicious, and with such zeal as to furnish occupation for all time to innumerable and increasing "social settlements"!

CAROLYN SHIPMAN.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE BRUSSELS SUGAR CONVENTION.

BY BENJAMIN TAYLOR.

THE tariff movement in the United States and the negotiations for a reciprocal treaty between Canada and the West Indies make it desirable to consider what the Brussels Convention really is, and what it has done in especial for British colonies and British industries. In some quarters the fallacy has been current that the British sugar duty and the Brussels Convention combined to raise the price of sugar on the inevitable "poor man." The British duty and the Convention have nothing whatever to do with each other, and the only effect the Convention has had on prices has been to bring them to the level of economic conditions which they had not under the bounties.

Even the most ardent Free Traders had to confess that Protection did make the beet-sugar industry of Germany. After the Franco-German War, as an immense army had to be maintained and emigration had to be checked, home employment in Germany had to be found for the largest possible population in order to supply soldiers. The cultivation of beet-root for sugar furnished a large source of employment, and it became a matter of Imperial policy to encourage this industry. It was soon found to be very profitable, and rapidly advanced and outgrew the home requirements. Then the system of granting drawbacks on exported sugar provided a fresh source of profit, which formed the bounty. A similar arrangement was adopted in Austria-Hungary, and in both countries Protection permitted the formation of *kartels,* which allowed the sugar manufacturers and refiners to charge prices at home that insured handsome profits and led to still further expansions of the sugar industry. In Russia, which was not a first party to the Brussels Convention, a system of indirect bounties prevailed which encouraged the production and exportation of sugar to non-Convention countries.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The gains from the bounties enabled the Continental beet-sugar exporters always to undersell cane-sugar, which finally could not obtain a price to cover the cost of production, no matter how much the planter might economize. The weakest went to the wall first, some cane-planters with means held on longer, but all backward properties were abandoned and only those which were well situated and well equipped continued in the race. In Java, sugar plantations have always been well equipped and they are worked on strictly scientific lines, with the advantages of an abundance of cheap labor, so that cane-sugar is produced there more cheaply, probably, than anywhere else; but even in Java it was at one time seriously debated whether the industry would not have to be abandoned. The result of the bounty system was that no cane-planter could develop his estate or improve his machinery, no new plantations were made, and no one would put money into a cane-sugar scheme in a British Crown Colony. Therefore, orders for sugar machinery dwindled away almost to the vanishing-point. During the period 1900 to 1902, the output of those engineers in Great Britain who engage in this class of work was not more than one-fourth of that of former normal years.

The German Sugar-makers' Associations frankly rejoiced that Colonial cane-planters were being driven off the field, that their capital was gone, their credit exhausted, and that a continuance of low prices would ultimately complete their ruin. The policy of the Continental beet-sugar makers was to keep down prices until cane-sugar competition would be forced out; beet would then control the markets of the whole world. The Brussels Conference, however, upset that policy. The Convention abolished the State Bounties and diminished protection to an amount that prohibited *kartels*. The Continental beet-sugar manufacturers have now no artificial stimulus to overproduction, and have to be content with supplying their share of the world's demands at prices fixed by open competition regulated by the production year by year of the whole sugar world.

The United Kingdom was the only country in which the bounties upon Continental sugar were of service to the producers in marketing their produce. The West-Indian Colonies received no bounties and were placed at a great disadvantage in all markets—except the United States, where bounty-fed sugar

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

was countervailed. In the British markets these Colonies are at a geographical disadvantage as compared with the Continental beet producers. The serious condition of these colonies was thus noted in the report of the West India Royal Commission:

"Dealing broadly with the whole question, we may say at once that, looking to the low prices now prevailing and to the probabilities as to the future of prices, the sugar-cane industry of the West Indies is threatened with such reduction in the immediate future as may not in some of the Colonies differ very greatly from extinction, and must seriously affect all of them, with the single exception of Grenada, which no longer produces sugar for export."

The Commissioners further gave it as their opinion that,

"The benefit which the British Empire as a whole derives from any lowering of the price of sugar, due to the operation of the bounty system, is too dearly purchased by the injury which that system imposes on a limited class, namely, Your Majesty's West-Indian and other subjects dependent on the sugar industry."

Some Free Traders would do nothing to abolish bounties, on the erroneous assumption that the abolition of them would deprive consumers in Great Britain of the benefit of "cheap sugar." The late Lord Farrer, when chairman of the Cobden Club (in 1897), however, said:

"Upon that point [sugar bounties] we, as Free-Traders, must walk warily. We must admit to the fullest degree that sugar bounties are an abomination and we must not, because they make sugar a little cheaper in this country, say they ought to be continued."

And as to the claim that the bounties had been a great boon to this country, bad as they had been for British colonies, Sir Neville Lubbock said:

"No evidence is vouchsafed in support of this assertion, and I venture to say that, if an impartial estimate were made and a balance struck between the losses inflicted on this country by the collapse of its sugar and allied industries, on the one hand, and the gain accruing to our consumers from any lowering of the price of sugar which may legitimately be traced to the operation of the bounty system, on the other hand, it would be found that this country stands to gain very largely by the abolition of that system."

The removal of the bounties led to the disappearance of the divergent scale of European prices, and actually increased the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

demand for sugar. The total abolition of burdens and a freed consumption have given the producers better results than any derived from the old system. The British consumer has to pay no more for his sugar than *its true economic value*. And there has been renewed prosperity of the home and Colonial trade.

It is necessary to recall that the Brussels Conference of 1898 was fruitless as regards its main purpose, though it found that the majority of the bounty-giving nations were willing to throw off the burden; but France and Russia then barred the way to an agreement by reserving from discussion their internal legislation which conferred an indirect bounty on exportation. The French expressed willingness to abolish the direct bounty granted in 1897, but refused to discuss the indirect bounty, which was three times as large. The Russian Government at that time had no intention of altering its external legislation. All efforts at a compromise were therefore unsuccessful. In October, 1900, however, a preliminary agreement was concluded between Germany, Austria-Hungary and France, with the object of paving the way for further negotiations. France was by this time willing to give up her export bounty and one-half of her indirect bounty, on condition that Germany and Austria-Hungary would give up all their bounties.

The material difference between the latest Brussels Conference and the first (1888) International Conference at London may be briefly indicated. At the London Conference of 1888 all the bounty-giving Powers met for the purpose of discussing the best means for the abolition of sugar bounties. The object of the British Government of that day was to endeavor to bring about a mutual agreement by which this vexed question should find a practical solution. The result of that Conference was the signature of a Convention by the representatives of Great Britain and the bounty-giving Powers, containing a penal clause by which, after a ceratin date, the signatories—with the exception of France and (with certain reservations) Austria—agreed to exclude bounty-fed sugar, either by absolute prohibition or by countervailing duties levied upon it. The necessary Bill was prepared, and introduced by the present Lord Pirbright into the House of Commons; but, owing to the opposition of certain members of the Gladstonian party, the measure was dropped.

Fourteen years afterwards a Convention was signed at the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

third Conference at Brussels, on March 5th, 1902, which Convention is now in existence.

The high contracting parties therein undertook to suppress all direct and indirect bounties by which the production or export of sugar would benefit, and not to establish any bounties of the kind during the whole duration of the Convention. This applies to all advantages resulting directly or indirectly, for the several categories of producers, from the fiscal legislation of the contracting States, including the direct bonuses granted to exports, the direct bonuses granted to production, total or partial exemptions from taxation granted for a part of the manufactured output, profits derived from the surplusages of output, profits derived from exaggeration of the drawback, and advantages derived from any surtax in excess of the rate fixed by article four. The second article deals with arrangements for the surveillance of factories. In article three, the contracting parties undertook to limit the surtax to a maximum of 6 francs per 100 kilogrammes for refined sugar, and to a maximum of 5 francs 59 centimes for other sugars. The surtax is the difference between the rate of duty or taxation to which foreign sugars are subject and that imposed on the home product. The provisions of this article do not apply to the rates of import duties in the case of countries that do not produce sugar and, therefore, not to Great Britain. By article four the contracting parties agreed to impose a special duty on imports into their respective territories of sugars from countries that grant bounties either for production or export. This duty is not to be less than the amount of the bounties, direct or indirect, granted in the country of origin; and the Powers reserved liberty to prohibit altogether the importation of bountied sugars. Article five provided that cane and beet sugars ought not to be subjected to different rates of duty. By article six, Spain, Italy and Sweden were freed from the obligation imposed in article one, as far as producing countries are concerned, as well as from the undertakings embodied in articles three and four, as long as they do not export sugar. Article seven provided for the establishment of a permanent International Commission of Surveillance to sit at Brussels. This Commission exercises a general control, settles any litigious questions that arise, and decides as to the admission of States that did not take part in the original Confer-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ence. In article eight the high contracting parties undertook to prevent bounty-fed sugars, which have passed in transit through a contracting country, from enjoying the advantages of the Convention in the market to which they are being forwarded. According to article nine, States which have taken no part in the Convention may be admitted to adhere to it at their request, and after giving notice in conformity to the permanent International Commission. By article ten the Convention came into force on September 1st, 1903, to remain valid for five years from that date; and in the case of any of the high contracting parties not having given notice, twelve months before the expiration of five years, of its intention of ceasing to abide by it, it will continue to remain in force for a year thereafter, and in the same way from year to year. In the event of one of the contracting Powers denouncing the Convention, this denunciation will only have effect on that Power. The other Powers retain, until October 31st of the year in which the denunciation is made, the right of announcing their intention of withdrawing on September 1st of the succeeding year. If more than one Power desires to withdraw, a conference of the Powers shall meet at Brussels within three months to decide upon the course to be taken. By article eleven the provisions of the Convention apply to oversea provinces, colonies and foreign possessions of the contracting parties, with the exception of the British and Dutch colonies and possessions, regarding which declarations were inserted in a final protocol.

The concluding protocol of the Convention runs as follows:

"On the point of proceeding to the signature of the Sugar Convention concluded this day between the Governments of Germany, Austria-Hungary, Belgium, Spain, France, Great Britain, Italy, Netherlands and Sweden, the undersigned plenipotentiaries are agreed as follows: As regards Article III, seeing that the object of surtax is an efficacious protection of the market of each producing country, the high contracting parties reserve to themselves the right to propose an increase of the surtax should considerable quantities of sugar from one of the contracting States find their way into their own territories. This increase would only apply to sugars coming from that State. Such a proposal must be addressed to the Commission provided for in Article VII, which will decide whether they are good enough for the proposed measure as to the period for which it shall be enforced, and on the extent of the increase, the latter shall not exceed one franc per 100 kilogrammes. The assent of the Commission shall only be given when

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

invasion of the market in question is the consequence of an actual inferiority and not the result of a fractious increase in price, brought about by an agreement between producers. As regards Article XI, (1) the Government of Great Britain declared that no bounty, direct or indirect, shall be granted to sugars from Crown Colonies during the duration of the Convention; (2) it also declared as an exceptional measure, and reserving in principle entire liberty of action as regards fiscal relations between the United Kingdom and its colonies and possessions, that during the duration of the Convention no preference will be granted in the United Kingdom to colonial sugars as against foreign; and (3) it finally declared that the Convention shall, by its intermediation, be submitted to the self-governing colonies and East Indies, so that they may have an opportunity of giving their adhesion to it. It is understood that the British Government has power to adhere to the Convention on behalf of Crown Colonies. The Government of the Netherlands declares that for one duration of the Convention no bounty, direct or indirect, shall be granted sugars from Dutch Colonies, and that such sugars shall not be admitted into the Netherlands at lower tariff than that applied to sugars from any of the contracting countries."

This Convention, then, provided a method of abolishing bounties by international agreement, which the Legislatures of the several countries concerned duly ratified. The Convention did not come into force until September, 1903, because the sugar year extends from September 1st to August 31st; and, as a large part of the business in sugar is done on forward contracts, these contracts would be largely conditioned by the sowings and arrangements of 1902-3. The beet farmers and manufacturers of the Continent were allowed time to adjust themselves to the new conditions.

An objection was urged on account of the stipulation in the protocol that Great Britain shall give no preferential treatment to the sugar of her colonies during the duration of the Convention; but cane-sugar in the tropics, under vigorous and scientific management, can be produced more cheaply than beet-sugar in Europe. Under the Convention, Britain cannot differentiate in favor of colonial sugar. The only course for the Colonies was to waken up, and, by the aid of fresh capital, to improve and cheapen the cost and increase the bulk of production. It was suggested that the limitations of the Convention to five years would prove a discouragement to the investment of capital in the West Indies. This has not been so, and the Convention can only terminate by all the parties denouncing it.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

From an industrial point of view the Convention has been of the highest importance to Great Britain. There has been no ground for the fears of those who thought or said that the abolition of the bounties would make sugar so dear as to injure her jam, confectionery and biscuit industries. These industries stand on their merits. They produce what were once luxuries, but are now ranked among the necessaries of life to the middle and working classes. Sugar has not been made "dear" in an economic sense, and the sugar-consuming industries are in effect protected from foreign competition by the high duties imposed on the consumption of sugar on the Continent.

The effect of the Convention was to make it more convenient for the Continental beet-sugar manufacturers to export raw, rather than refined, sugar. Thus resulted the revival of the British refining industry, previously decadent. Under the adverse influence of the bounties, sugar-refining fell off very seriously in Great Britain; the imports of raw sugar declined and those of refined sugar increased. But there has been an increase in the imports and deliveries of raw sugar since the Convention year.

There was an enormous increase in refined sugar under the bounties up to 1900-02, then a sharp decline after the Convention year. Britain has not consumed less refined sugar since 1903, but she has refined more herself, to the advantage of British labor. One may search the statistics in vain for any evidence in support of the complaint of confectionery and aerated-water manufacturers that the Convention has hurt their export trade: and one can certainly find no indication of any falling off in the domestic consumption of these products.

Although in the countries (Britain excepted) which are parties to the Convention beet-sugar still enjoys some protection, it amounts to only forty-two shillings per ton. West-Indian cane-sugar is not protected, and in competition with European countries it has to bear this handicap of about one farthing per pound. But, even with this disadvantage, the conditions secured by the Convention for the cane-sugar growers wrere practically those of Free Trade, and their effects were very soon made apparent by the increasing orders given out from the Colonies for improved machinery for cane-sugar making.

The usual estimate of annual outlay on machinery by cane-planters was one pound, sterling, per ton of sugar produced,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

For the British West Indies alone this would represent about £250,000 per annum, and for the whole cane-sugar industry it would represent several millions per annum. British engineers have never, of course, had all this machinery trade to themselves. The French have always had some proportion of it; and, latterly, American, Dutch and German engineers have sought and obtained some share (although their home markets are securely protected against foreign sugar machinery). But, wherever cane-sugar is made, the work of British engineers is to be found, and it still preserves its high reputation. The proximity of Cuba to the United States favored cheap freights for American machinery, tariff arrangements give it an advantage of two and one-half per-cent., and financial combinations ensure for it a further preference. Nevertheless, Great Britain has benefited even in Cuba during the few years the Brussels Convention has been in operation.

Although cane-planters on the verge of bankruptcy could not instantly renovate their plant, their machinery requirements have steadily increased since 1902, and British engineers have been employing double and treble the number of men they employed for ten years previous to that date. But on the threatened abandonment, two years ago, of the Brussels Convention various schemes were arrested, and so British enterprise was once more checked and the employment for British workers was again menaced.

The future development of the sugar products of the world to meet the ever-increasing demand (at the rate of about four per cent. per annum) is more likely to be in cane than in beet, because the former costs really less to produce. But if the Brussels Convention terminated and the bounty system were revived, the cane-sugar industry would again diminish, if not disappear, and with it sugar-refining, sugar-machinery manufacture and the other allied trades, in Great Britain. In these days, when the question of lack of employment is an open one and the Labor vote is abroad, it is an important consideration how the bounty system is, after all, a matter which directly affects the welfare of the Mother Country, and especially its working-men, as well as that of the sugar Colonies.

A number of the small West India proprietors who had intended to improve their plants decided not to do anything until they knew what would happen as to the Convention in September,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

1908. One who visited the West-Indian islands, and conversed with the bulk of the cane-sugar growers there, found that, whilst they were prepared to consider schemes for the improvement of their properties, so as to enable them to exist by producing sugar at prices which would compete with beet-root sugar in the British market, they were not prepared to make any fresh expenditure so long as there was any possibility of the Brussels Convention being denounced. The feeling was that, if they have again to compete against bounty-fed sugar in the British market, they must grow cotton or fruit, if possible, as it will certainly not pay to continue to grow sugar.

As to prices in bounty days and prices since the Convention, the following are the old tariff average prices of beet-root, granulated and cane-sugar for the eight years 1896-1903, and the tariff average prices for 1904-1906:

	88 Per cent. Beet-root.	First marks granulated.	Cane-sugar
	s. d.	*s. d.*	*s. d.*
1896	10 6	12 3	12 7
1897	8 9	10 7	10 10
1898	9 7	11 4	11 6
1899	10	11 6	12 1
1900	10 7	12 1½	13 6
1901	8 7	10 5	11 3
1902	6 8	8 1	8
1903	8 3¼	9 8½	9 10½
1904	9 9	11 7	11 1½
1905	11 6½	13 7¼	12 10
1906	8 7½	10 8½	9 9

The advance in prices in 1903 was due to short crops of beet on the Continent, owing partly to reduced sowings, but mainly to drought. Then came larger sowings and a full crop of beet, but in 1905 the Cuban troubles caused an advance in cane-sugar. Neither of these movements had anything to do with the Convention, but the effects would have been much greater had there been no Convention. For this reason: if the Continental bounties had not been abolished, the production of cane-sugar in the West Indies would have fallen off; whereas, owing to the stimulus given to the industry, the world's crop of cane-sugar, which was 4,296,506 tons in 1903-4, has been raised steadily year by year up to 5,000,000 tons. The product of a cane-sugar estate cannot be

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

increased much in a couple of years; the plants need time to grow and become productive. A beet farm can be made productive within six months; and the world's beet crop which dropped from 5,881,333 tons in 1903-4 to 4,712,976 tons in 1904-5 rose to about 6,670,000 tons in 1906-7.

The sugar-market has now two unrestricted sources of supply, and is not controlled by the beet-growers and the bounties. Therefore, the current prices in the market of the world are economic prices, regulated by the relation of supply to demand, and influenced only by the conditions which apply to all natural products. What the Convention, then, has done has been to preserve the British sugar Colonies from ruin, to revive Britain's domestic refining industry, to restore a disappearing branch of the engineering industry, and to preserve for the world two large and alternative sources of supply of one of the world's chief articles of consumption.

It so happens that none of the Continental beet-growing countries is now anxious to resume the heavy economic burden of the bounties. Therefore, they were willing to meet the wishes of the present British Government with regard to the penal clause of the Convention, and after much discussion the Permanent Sugar Commission at Brussels agreed in 1907 upon an additional Act to the following effect:

"The Governments of Germany, Austria, Hungary, Belgium, France, Great Britain, Italy, the Grand Duchy of Luxemburg, Holland, Peru, Sweden and Switzerland, having agreed to conclude a supplementary Act to the Convention of March 5th, 1902, relating to the sugar *régime*, the undersigned, duly authorized, have come to the following agreement:

"Article I. The contracting States engage to maintain the Convention of March 5th, 1902, in force for a further period of five years, from September 1st, 1908. Nevertheless, it shall be open to any one of them to withdraw from the Convention after September 1st, 1911, by giving notice one year in advance, if, at the last sitting held by the Permanent Commission before September 1st, 1910, it decided that circumstances render it necessary that this facility be given to the contracting States. For the rest the provisions of Article X of the Convention of March 5th, 1902, concerning the denunciation and renewal of the same, remain in force.

"Article II. As an exception to Article I Great Britain shall be released, from September 1st, 1908, from the obligations contained in Article IV of the Convention. From this same date the contracting Powers shall have the right to exact that, in order to obtain the benefits

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the Convention, all sugar refined in the United Kingdom and exported to their countries shall be accompanied by a certificate to the effect that no portion of such sugar comes from a country recognized by the Permanent Commission as giving bounties on the production or exportation of sugar.

"Article III. The present Supplementary Act shall be ratified, and the ratifications shall be deposited at the Ministry for Foreign Affairs at Brussels as quickly as possible, and in any case before February 1st, 1908. Its provisions shall not become obligatory unless it is ratified by at least all those contracting Powers who do not come under the exceptional terms of Article VI of the Convention. In case one or more of the said Powers shall have failed to deposit their ratifications within the specified time, the Belgian Government, during the month beginning February 1st, 1908, shall call upon such Powers as have ratified to decide whether the present Supplementary Act shall be applied as between themselves. The States which shall have failed to ratify before the date fixed, viz., February 1st, 1908, shall be considered as having denounced the Convention within the prescribed limits for it to cease to bind them from the following September 1st, unless a decision has been given in a contrary sense at the request of the Powers in question by a majority of the States summoned to deliberation, as set forth in the preceding paragraph."

The following "Protocol of Signature" was also agreed to:

"It is agreed that if the ratifications necessary according to Article III to give validity to the Supplementary Act have not been handed in before March 1st, 1908, the British Government shall be at liberty to denounce the Convention at that date from September 1st, 1908, whether or not they shall have previously ratified the Supplementary Act."

This was confirmed by the principal Powers concerned, and therefore the Convention will remain in force for other five years at any rate, although, if any important Power fails to ratify its signature before March 1st next, the British Government will be at liberty to denounce it at that date. But the non-ratifying Power may withdraw and leave the others to carry it on. As, however, the only sugar-exporting country of any consequence that was not party to the original Convention was Russia, and as Russia has now been admitted to the Convention, it is not probable that any further difficulty will arise in the near future. By the terms of the Supplementary Act, Great Britain may now receive Argentine sugar, which is bounty-fed. But Argentina has little or none to spare for export.

BENJAMIN TAYLOR.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE GOVERNMENT OWNERSHIP OF DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR BUILDINGS AND THEIR EQUIPMENT.

BY CAPTAIN F. M. BARBER, U. S. NAVY, RETIRED. LATE NAVAL ATTACHÉ AT TOKIO, PEKIN, BERLIN, ROME, VIENNA.

ALTHOUGH the annual Congressional Public Buildings Bill is continually increasing, it is evident from numerous indications that the United States Government will soon adopt the policy of owning its diplomatic and consular buildings abroad, and the time is not far distant when travelling Americans will no longer be mortified at the sight of the United States Embassy or Legation being located on a single floor in an apartment-house or office building with a tin shield over the door, far inferior in appearance to that of many a butcher or baker in the vicinity.

In the early days of our history, when modesty in appearance was a necessary accompaniment of economy in expenditure, it was highly desirable that our rented establishments abroad should reflect the sterling principles of our forefathers; but as the years have gone by the very economy which we sought has become ridiculously distorted into the payment of annual rentals whose accumulation represents a sum which would have bought the buildings themselves over and over again, and still we have the buildings yet to buy. Meantime our country has grown to be one of the richest nations on the face of the earth and our representatives should be installed in a manner more worthy of the country they represent, for of all nations Americans abroad are most fond of frequenting their Embassies, Legations and Consulates.

There is, too, another aspect of this early simplicity idea which it is, perhaps, well not to lose sight of. In those days our weakness excited the sympathy of Continental Europe, and our repre-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sentative was Franklin, one of the most remarkable men of the day, one who could converse equally well with a man of science, a diplomat or a court lady; indeed, it was his popularity with the latter which gave him his enormous influence, for he was a new species of lion to exhibit in their salons. Court uniform was deemed absolutely necessary in those days, and when, after being well received in society, Franklin was officially presented at court it is said that his tailor did not bring home his uniform in time, and he had the nerve to go in simple habit and so made a great hit. He was quick to perceive this himself, and he thus laid the foundation of an honorable custom which has since become deservedly a matter of national pride. But we are no longer a weak nation, and instead of exciting sympathy it is fair to say that we excite an honest envy because we are not handicapped by the historic traditions of older people and our future is somewhat dreaded by Europe.

Now that the time for the buildings is arriving, however, it would seem that to make haste slowly is the part of wisdom, so that the structures to be erected may be in accordance with the best ideas of modern business requirements and typical of the most practical people of the present day. Judging from the discussions in Congress and the attitude of various newspapers, the idea seems to be quite prevalent in the United States that the main object of these new buildings is to afford our representatives the means of giving gorgeous receptions and handsome dinners, as though the dignity of the United States would be supported and the attainment of diplomatic objects be effected by display and through gastronomic attractions; but such is not the case. Time was, of course, when diplomacy meant intrigue and petticoat influence and subterranean methods generally; but that time has gone by, and it is extremely doubtful if in the last twenty years there has been a single instance where the official interests of the United States have been advanced in the slightest degree by any social entertainments whatever. Our representatives should not, by the smallness of their salaries, be put in a position such that they cannot suitably return the social civilities offered them; and, indeed, for many reasons an increase of salary is far more important than anything else that can be done for them; but that is another story. There does not at present seem to be much disposition, on the part of Congress, to increase the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pay of the diplomatic corps, although an English Ambassador receives $40,000 per year with his house and entertaining expenses, while an American Ambassador receives only $17,500 and nothing found. Under any circumstances, however, whether the Ambassador entertains foreigners or not, is no matter of national importance.

What should concern our people, however, is the fact that, while in Washington we have official buildings superior to those of any other country for the transaction of business, abroad we occupy quarters neither creditable to a first-class nation nor large enough for the purpose. We recognize at home that every Senator and Member and every leading official should have a large, airy, well-equipped office, but we fail to see that in foreign capitals we ought to take pride in showing that these same ideas are most conducive to the satisfactory discharge of public affairs even there. To buy a handsome building for an Ambassador or Minister to reside in and to relegate the offices to a mediocre flat or other makeshift would be to repeat officially the joke well known to all naval officers in Yokohama thirty years ago, where a missionary built a minute chapel and a large brick residence and then reported to the home society that he had erected a handsome church for the heathen and with the few remaining bricks had built himself an humble mansion.

Nor is it our policy to follow blindly in the footsteps of European nations and by erecting buildings similar to theirs repeat their defects. Generally speaking, these buildings consist of a handsome central body with two wings enclosing a court separated from the street by a wall having one or two huge gateways for the entry and exit of carriages. The Ambassador's residence and reception-rooms are in the body, the Embassy proper in one wing and the servants' quarters and stables in the other; but these buildings are mostly old and when erected were without modern conveniences and the enormous increase in Government business, the change from horse vehicles to automobiles, the much greater crowds to be handled at official functions owing to the facilities of modern travel, etc., make these buildings obsolete in spite of the continual alterations that are being made to them, and the stories that are added because they have no more ground space.

Poor nations like Japan may wisely buy and alter old buildings,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

but we should start with a clean slate. Americans are beginning to realize that our geographical situation alone is absolutely certain to make us eventually the first nation in the world, both physically and financially, and that our preponderance in commercial affairs and the necessity for markets will demand our taking an interest in many world matters which our ancestors never dreamed of. Hence the desirability of establishing our representatives in the capitals of the world in a manner that is worthy of our great future and of doing it deliberately.

Briefly it would seem desirable, first, to send a commission of architects abroad to study the local conditions in each capital of the world. Then buy land—a whole block—in any healthy quarter, whether fashionable or not, for fashion will follow the flag. Plan the Embassy and Consulate General on a corner lot, with offices on one street and the ambassadorial residence on the other, with a tower at the point from the top of which the national flag may float on proper occasions, instead of being stuck out of a window like that of a ship in distress.* Having an entrance on each street, an arriving and departing crowd, no matter how large, can be handled with facility; whereas with an entrance only on one street three-quarters of an hour for arrival must now be allowed in a line of carriages at an ordinary diplomatic reception and one hour and a quarter to get away after one has said good-by.

Two interior wings would be required for archives, library, visitor's reading-room, garage, etc., and ample space even beyond this should be allowed for future expansion. The increased value of the remainder of the block would in a short time pay for the investment. One advantage of this method of procedure would be that in most cases the plans could be submitted to Congress at the same time that an appropriation was asked for and they could be published in the newspapers. It is really surprising to see what a unanimous feeling there is on this subject of Government ownership among the Americans travelling abroad, and yet how little opportunity there is for any one to actually do anything about it in a manner which will reach the people whose money is to be spent for the purpose.

* It is not advisable to have the residence of the Consul-General in this building. An increase of twenty per cent. in his salary for the specific purpose of house rent and the entertainment of American citizens would be much more practical.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The buildings, once erected, should be equipped with a complete staff of well-paid janitors, lift men, messengers, chauffeurs, etc. For this purpose United States colored men would be most uniformly satisfactory; they are typically American in appearance, they are loyal and they have an intuitive faculty for learning foreign languages by ear, which few people in the United States suspect. Besides, they always have a hearty welcome for American visitors, which cannot be said for many of the foreigners that we are forced to employ. In any event, "let none but Americans be on guard." During our war with Spain, when it was necessary to do a great deal of hard work at our Embassies, and when the entire sympathy of Continental Europe was against us, it was embarrassing to have people in our service whom we dared not trust and whose patriotism was not our patriotism.

There are two objections to the locating of buildings in the manner that I have suggested. The first is their exposure to mob attack in case of a popular demonstration, which was always carefully considered in planning the older Embassies, but the progress of civilization and the business advantages would, it is thought, counterbalance this defect nowadays. The second is the accessibility of the Ambassador, out of office hours, to persistent Americans who insist on seeing him whether he wants to be seen or not. This difficulty is one to which the representatives of other nations are not so much subject. No person, for example, who has not been presented at the English Court, would presume to besiege an English Ambassador for social attentions, tickets to official functions, etc.; but there are a few citizens of our country (where it is easier to be presented to the President than it is to see a doctor, because it costs nothing) to whom the idea that an Ambassador or his wife has any right to privacy is entirely wanting. Such people often think that they own the Embassy, and one could not do like the old admiral who in a similar case cut a chip out of the wooden deck and handed it to the intruder as he was assisted over the ship's side with the remark that he could take his share with him. The ancient Egyptians buried their kings at the end of a long dark tunnel in the side of a mountain. In the middle of the tunnel was a huge pit into which plunderers might fall. It must be confessed that this plan did not ultimately succeed, for no Egyptian king's tomb has been

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

found unrifled. Still, if such a tunnel connected the Ambassador's office and his residence it might kill a few of the more heedless.

The social side of a diplomat's duties is a thorny topic to discuss, but it is very important. His official duties can be regulated by cable, but not so his social duties. In the first place, few Americans understand that diplomats and their wives are not required by etiquette to return visits in person; a return by card is all that is required; but this is absolutely necessary, and there is no social crime that our representatives and their wives more often commit than to neglect this simple courtesy. It is largely due to the fact that there is no one at a United States Embassy or Legation whose specific duty it is to care for the cards, and oftentimes a second or third secretary, when the pressure is great, has to be diverted from his legitimate duties to attend to it. Many a diplomat has made a lifelong enemy of a man he never knew by thus slighting the latter or his wife. There should be a special secretary (preferably a lady) attached to an Embassy to attend to these social requirements. This part of the equipment may seem silly to plain Americans at home, but let them come abroad and be treated that way themselves once and see how long it will be before they will forget it; and silly or not silly, it is the social side of an American diplomat's existence which causes ninety per cent. of his diplomatic troubles.

I would go further and say that the Embassy should be equipped with minute printed instructions about matters of courtesy; something like we have in the navy regulations, for example. People new to diplomatic life cannot be expected to know these things, and many who do know will disregard them. Sometimes an Ambassador on leave will make a continued stay in the capital to which a colleague is accredited and never go near him. Sometimes an Ambassador's wife will pay no attention to commercial people on the ground that they belong to the Consul-General's wife, etc. Such things should not be permitted.

Naturally, people who expect social attentions usually bring letters of introduction, but even these get mislaid and lost, much to the chagrin of all concerned when it is discovered. In the old days in Japan, where the Legations of all countries were thrown much together because we were strangers in a strange land, special passports or letters of introduction were known by

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the English name of soup-tickets, and a pleasant dinner, which we all attended, was considered to be the proper attention that should be paid to the bearer. But in Europe, where there are so many more travellers, the problem is not so simple. Suppose, for example, the diplomat's wife mixes up a variety of soup-ticket holders and invites them to meet each other at the same dinner. The chances are that they may all freeze the atmosphere, because at home they do not speak or because they had expected to meet foreign nobility. Suppose, however, that she has provided for this emergency, then the table may be disarranged in an unexpected manner. Once when I was detailed by the Ambassador's wife to take a charming young American girl out to dinner and was just polishing up my brains for conversational purposes, suddenly her mother engineered herself into the seat next me and navigated the daughter alongside a young nobleman much in demand in the matrimonial market. The hostess was much amused, and I was quite pleased, too, for the lady was very intelligent and, anyway, she is dead now.

Sometimes, too, weird people appear with special passports: people it would be awkward to invite any one to meet. I remember once in another capital— But perhaps I had better reserve that reminiscence for my memoirs. Then there were the ladies who wished to travel before coming to our capital and who sent all their heavy luggage to the Embassy direct from the steamer and were so very wroth when they arrived and found that it was in the custom-house, and the multitude of others who had their mail sent there, and the poor beggars of distressed Americans who used to turn up from time to time, not knowing that the United States is the only country that makes no provision for sending such people home. The Ambassador and his wife, and the Attachés and their wives, and the Consul-General and his wife, and the Consular Attachés and their wives, all have a financial knowledge of the distressed American that the good people at home wot not of.

But the real riddle for the diplomat's wife to solve is that of the American colony, of which she is or ought to be the social leader. This colony in the principal capitals of Europe consists of three classes: the wives of Americans in business, ladies educating their children and ladies of leisure. Now, what shall she do with these? Shall she class them or hash them? The riddle

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is as bad as that of the Sphinx, but Œdipus finally solved that one and a few tactful ladies have solved this one; but with most ladies it is a choice between Scylla and Charybdis, and whatever plan they decide to pursue they regret it. Perhaps they may then turn exclusively to foreign society; but this only excites the contempt of the entire colony, as it ought to do, and the ridicule of the foreigners themselves.

All this goes to illustrate the trite saying that a circle is much more convex when viewed from the outside than it is when viewed from the inside, and those who imagine that the social life of a diplomat is a bed of roses are quite mistaken. The moral seems to be that the prudent diplomat will entertain whom he pleases, but in as quiet a manner as possible and never have his guest list published.

Our national holidays are, of course, exceptions. On these days all the American world, both travelling and local, should be welcomed with the most lavish hospitality, and the entire list should be published. No matter whether an American lives abroad or has been away from the United States only a week, he likes to tread American soil (and Embassies and Legations are American soil), and most Americans have the good sense to be quite satisfied with this amount of attention. Whether the ladies are in travelling, visiting or décolleté gowns, or the men in checked suits, frock coats or ulsters and goloshes, they all thoroughly enjoy themselves, and it is a pleasure to mingle with them. To a naval officer who has been long abroad, but is still an American, even "plain Jane with no trimmings" is an attractive object; but at any one of these receptions he will see more pretty girls to the square yard than any other nation can produce, and as General Porter once said to me enthusiastically at one of his receptions in Paris: "There is nothing like 'em."

NOTE.—Since the above article was written, a society has been formed among Americans in London for the purpose of agitating this question, which shows its increasing importance.

F. M. BARBER.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE POSITION OF ENGLISH RAILWAYS.

BY W. M. ACWORTH.

FIFTY years ago, not in England only, but throughout the civilized world, the English railway system used to be described as the greatest monument of private enterprise that the world had ever known. Within the lifetime of one generation private enterprise, with no help and not a little hindrance from the State, had, it was pointed out, constructed in Great Britain a network of railways which covered the whole face of the country, and was providing over that network a service of trains admirable both in speed and frequency. It was pointed out, too, how far the railways of the Continent, which, even where they were not directly State-owned, depended largely upon the Government for their existence, lagged behind the private railway companies of England. Now that the fifty years have passed, it looks as though the next chapter to be written in the history of English railways will need to be headed "The Death of Private Enterprise."

All the signs at the present moment point in the same direction. Socialists, State Socialists and semi-Socialists of all sorts and conditions desire to see the State take over the railways. Sometimes the formula is "nationalization of the means of production"; sometimes it runs that "natural monopolies should be in public hands." But, whatever the formula and by whatever process, logical or illogical, arrived at, the result is that a very large number of people have an abstract preference for State, as distinct from private, ownership. Other influences are of a more concrete nature. The railway employees would undoubtedly be found in very large majority on the same side. They think that the State employer would be sure to give them either more wages for the same work or less work for the same wages—or, possibly, even both benefits, less work and more wages,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

combined. And they are probably not far wrong in so thinking. The post-office employees are a much smaller and much less influential, because more scattered body of voters, and they have undoubtedly been able to extract from the not wholly disinterested sympathy of Members of Parliament conditions of service markedly superior to those enjoyed by men doing work of a similar standard in private employ. There is yet another important class whose influence will make in the same direction: the railway shareholders and their officials. Given State purchase on fair terms—and State purchase of private property in this country has always hitherto been on terms that have been more than fair to the dispossessed owner—shareholders are bound to welcome it; while, as for the officials, it is only natural that they should offer no objection to a system which would either secure for them an ample pension or else, while preserving their existing salaries, give them a higher status and more influential position as Government servants.

With all these forces making for State purchase, it is difficult to see what forces there are to counterbalance them. A certain number of reflecting citizens would undoubtedly view the proposition with deep distrust. But they are not numerous and are unorganized and therefore uninfluential, and they would hardly be likely to take off their coats for a serious struggle. Undoubtedly the permanent officials of the Civil Service responsible for the finances of the country (whom we speak of collectively as "The Treasury") would oppose strongly any proposal that would at one stroke much more than double the national debt. But, powerful as the Treasury is, it could not in the long run stand out against public opinion and a majority of the House of Commons. So, as I have said, it is probable that the purchase of the English railways by the State will be a live issue in English politics within a very few years; and—as one of the most distinguished professors of Political Economy in the United States said in my hearing a few weeks ago—if that were to happen the echoes of the fall of private ownership would ring through the length and breadth of America.

I have spoken above of the change that half a century has brought. But a comparison between the quite recent history of the railways of the United States and England, respectively, is also not without interest. Fifteen years ago or thereabouts, when

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the common stock of many American railroads now far away above par was almost sold by weight, the common, or ordinary, stock of English railways was the favorite investment of very thrifty people of the middle class. The ordinary stock of one of our great lines paying perhaps a dividend of six per cent. stood at a price which only yielded the investor a bare three and one-half per cent. for his money. As for new capital, the railway companies had only to hold out their hands and they could have it for the asking. There was no need to make a public issue. They peddled out their securities on the Stock Exchange, and the British public absorbed without hesitation as many millions of new stock as the railways thought fit to issue. And they issued that stock with a lavish hand. Stations and yards were enlarged all over the country, single lines were doubled and double lines were quadrupled over hundreds of miles. And naturally, for if nobody keeps a tight hand on the purse-strings, who can blame an operating official for desiring that the machine that he controls should have power amply to deal with all emergencies. To work traffic with inadequate rolling-stock on an overcrowded road may be extravagant, but it certainly implies hard and exhausting brain-work; and why exhaust one's brain when the Board of Directors are ready to order all the new rolling-stock asked for and to widen all the lines where congestion is so much as hinted at? And so, year after year, English railway capital went up by leaps and bounds, while no new territory was being developed and no new sources of traffic were being tapped.

The upshot is that English railways find themselves to-day in a position which has been described as "waterlogged" with capital. Dividends have fallen somewhat; the market valuation of the property has fallen far more, certainly not less than thirty per cent.; and companies which ten years ago were spending lavishly hardly dare to-day to attempt to raise money, and feel constrained to postpone even necessary improvements. Gross receipts have increased steadily, though not rapidly, according to American ideas; perhaps at an average rate of two and one-half per cent. per annum. But expenses have risen much faster, and the net income has actually fallen off. Meanwhile, American experience has been strikingly different. Companies that ten years ago were in the hands of a receiver are paying dividends

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of six and seven and even ten per cent., and the market value of the railroads of the United States has appreciated by a percentage at least as great as that by which the value of British railroads has depreciated. Of course this is not all due to the virtue or intelligence of American railway men. The abnormal growth of the United States has covered up not a few errors in policy, as well as a good deal of questionable or unquestionable finance. But the main difference, I think, has arisen from the stern lesson of adversity taught to American railways in the year of 1893, and from the way in which American railway officials took those lessons to heart. If an outsider might criticise, I should say that I am startled at the ingratitude which the American public has displayed in return for the marvellous skill and energy with which American railroad men revolutionized the operation of American railways in the years when traffic began to recover after the panic of 1893. New capital being practically unobtainable, they made one dollar do the work of two, and turned out with the old plant an output that would have been inconceivable to the men ten years before.

Regarding the matter from an operating side, the American railways have had enormous difficulties to face, and on the whole have surmounted them. Their colleagues here have not been so successful. They have failed to keep down operating expenses. With a rapid increase in expenses, coupled with a rapid growth of capital, the result to shareholders could hardly be satisfactory. But the railway profession in America has enjoyed one great advantage denied to it in England. The tradition of American business life is publicity; secrecy is the tradition of British business life. The habitual mental attitude of the English railways is that no information should be given to the public, because the public would be sure to use that information for nefarious ends. And information, if it exists, is sure sooner or later to reach the public. For fear of this, the British railway managements have denied themselves necessary information. They do not know today the average rate they charge for carrying a passenger or a ton of goods one mile. They do not know the average load of their trains or the average distance a ton of goods or a passenger is hauled. They possess no comprehensive system of units statistics by which a railroad can be compared with itself year by year or one railroad can be compared with its neighbors. In the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

absence of scientific information, scientific criticism and scientific discussion are alike impossible. One railway man cannot learn from the experience of another; the rising generation cannot be taught their profession scientifically, and are forced to rely on their own limited experience and rule-of-thumb methods.

It would not be fair to seem to imply that the present depressed condition of English railways is due merely to the shortcomings of English railway men of the present or of an earlier generation. Undoubtedly British railways have had great difficulties to face. With a revenue increasing but slowly, they have had to meet the demands, constantly more exacting, of the public and of the Legislature. But I am bound to say that the conditions they have had to face have not been as difficult as those that have been faced successfully in America. The British Legislature has interfered to require shorter hours of labor, large expenditure on safety appliances, and in some few cases even lower rates. But the sum total of it all has not been very serious. And I think an American railroad official would breathe a sigh of content if he could exchange the whips of Louisiana or the scorpions of Texas for the gentle parental suasion of the British Parliament. Wages on British railways have gone up and hours of labor have gone down. The same thing has happened in the States. But in the States better organization has enabled one man to do the work of two, with the result that, per ton handled, wages are down, not up. That result has, unfortunately, not been attained in Great Britain. Again, British railways have suffered severely from the competition of tramways; but the competition in America has been fiercer and more ubiquitous than here. American railroads met the competition at the outset with a considered policy. British railroads, with some exceptions, have done nothing but sit still and weep over the loss year after year of suburban passengers by the tens of millions.

And so, as I began by saying, English railways are to-day in a critical situation—a situation from which the only ultimate escape, in my judgment, will be by way of State purchase. But nature does not, as the old proverb says, advance by leaps; certainly not English nature. English opinion has not arrived at State purchase yet; it is only in the preliminary stage. The present talk is all about pools; about arrangements for community of interest. The English attitude of mind in this matter is quite

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

interesting. The average Englishman is, where his own personal interests are concerned, as strong an individualist as he ever was. He fully believes in competition where his own trade is touched, and he has not learned that the out-and-out competition of the open market is impossible in the special case of railways. On the other hand, he believes in combination in the abstract, and there is in England no such popular dread of pools as still exists in America. Pools have never been prohibited by English law. They have existed since the very beginning of English railways. One of the most famous and far-reaching pools was arranged more than sixty years ago by no less a person than Mr. Gladstone, and in not a few cases pools have been given direct Parliamentary authority. Some ten years ago the two railways which connect London with the Continent by way of Dover, the Southeastern and the London and Chatham, which had already pooled under statutory sanction a large part of their traffic, were united by an Act of Parliament, described as a "Working-Union Act," into one company for all purposes of operation and traffic, though not of capital. And the following year Parliament also sanctioned important amalgamations of railways in Ireland.

Of late years, then, public opinion has tended to magnify the waste of competition rather than to insist on its advantages from the public point of view, and the influence of railway shareholders, who, as I have said, have seen their property rapidly decreasing in value, has naturally been thrown in the same direction. Moreover, at a private conference at the Board of Trade* in the autumn of 1907, which is likely to be famous in English railway history, the President of the Board is understood to have expressed his personal sympathy with the prevailing sentiment.

The English railway managers were naturally not reluctant to set their sails to the favoring breeze. Early in 1908 it was announced that two English trunk lines, the Great Northern and the Great Central, had entered into a perpetual working agreement of the closest kind. They claimed that, under powers conferred by an Act of Parliament passed forty-nine years before, it was competent for them to do so, provided they obtained the consent of the Railway Commission. For that consent they

* The Board of Trade is a department of the Government and might well be called the Ministry of Commerce. Its President is a member of the Government and a Cabinet Minister.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

accordingly applied. When, however, the case came before the Commission, the Board of Trade found itself constrained, whatever the private sympathies of the President may have been, to take up a position which, if not of actual hostility, was by no means an attitude of approval. A considerable number of other opponents, rival railway companies, municipalities affected, and others, appeared, the result being that the Commission decided that they had no jurisdiction to sanction the proposed agreement and that the two companies must submit their proposals to Parliament in the usual way. And this the companies announced their intention of doing.

Before their Bill could be introduced into Parliament at the beginning of the present session of 1908-09 events further developed. A third trunk-line company, the Great Eastern, threw in its lot with the Great Northern and Great Central, and the Bill that was deposited provided for the working union of these three companies. In effect, it would have sanctioned the monopoly in the hands of one undertaking of the whole eastern half of England from the Thames to the Humber. About the same time two of the remaining trunk lines, the Northwestern and the Midland—companies whose united capital amounts to over $1,500,000,000—also announced that they had entered into a close alliance; and subsequently the Lancashire and Yorkshire—a company which, though it only has 500 miles of line, serves a population greater than that of the whole State of New York—is understood to have joined the alliance. These three companies between them control the whole northwest of England almost as completely as the other three companies control the east. The alliance to the west differs, however, from the proposed union on the east in important particulars. Each member of the alliance preserves its separate identity and retains its own sole control of non-competitive traffic. But all competitive traffic is to be the subject of agreement, and the whole of the receipts therefrom are to be pooled and divided between the allies in agreed proportions. Further, the alliance is not, it may be assumed, beyond the ordinary legal powers of the companies concerned, and they do not propose to ask any Parliamentary sanction to their bargain. Simultaneously movements in the direction of closer union have taken place among the railways both of Scotland and of Wales, but these latter need not be more than mentioned here.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The upshot of the position as sketched above is that throughout the greater part of Great Britain railway competition is dead. Theoretically, of course, competition survives between what I may call the east group and the west group to points where the two groups converge, say Manchester and Scotland. But the will to compete is gone, and if two parties refuse to compete it is quite certain that no outside authority can constrain them to do so. Further, unless the prevailing opinion among those interested in railway policy is more than usually wrong, those responsible for the management of the two groups have not yet by any means reached the goal at which they are aiming. The union of the three companies to the east and of the three companies to the west is, we are told, only a preliminary to the union of the whole six in a still more comprehensive agreement. The ultimate aim is alleged to be to unite all the railway companies of Great Britain into one single undertaking. And so it is thought that, on the one hand, the railway shareholders will have a more valuable property and one which will command a higher price when the State comes to buy; and, on the other hand, that the purchase by the State will be facilitated if there was only one venture instead of many to deal with. How far these suggestions and suppositions represent the real aims of the policy of the few men whose influence dominates the situation, it is not for an outsider to say. But no facts that have become public tend to disprove the correctness of the above prognosis.

Be this as it may, it is interesting to revert to the public history of the situation. The three eastern companies, as I have said, deposited in Parliament a Bill to sanction their union, and it very shortly became evident that the same traders who were in the abstract, convinced of the wastefulness of competition and who were quite prepared to see competition abolished over their neighbors' traffic, were by no means so ready to sacrific the advantages of competition when the traffic was their own. Parliament and the Board of Trade were besieged with objections from all and sundry. With great difficulty the influence of the Board procured for the Bill a second reading in the House of Commons; and when, after a debate which showed pretty distinctly that the Government was not carrying with it the sympathy of its own supporters, the Bill was read a second time and referred to a committee, so many petitions poured in and so many demands

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for far-reaching concessions were made upon the companies that they abandoned in despair the attempt to obtain Parliamentary sanction to their proposals and withdrew their Bill. They are continuing, however, it is understood, so far as they can do so within the scope of their legal powers, to work in close union.

To complete the story the Board of Trade have within the last few weeks appointed a committee to advise them on the whole question of amalgamation. To the plain man it is not quite apparent why they have wanted advice. They did not invite it before they committed themselves to a policy which is practically amalgamation. But, on the other hand, if they did not want advice at the earlier stage, why do they want it now when the question of Parliamentary sanction has for the present been decided?

Such, in outline, is the present position in England. Throughout the greater part of the country competition is dead and shows no signs of coming to life again. Yet the whole English railway system has grown up on the basis of competition. Foreign countries have relied for the control of their railways on State regulation. Englishmen have relied for control first and foremost on competition, with only a minimum supplement of State control in matters with which competition could not deal, such as excessive rates and provision for public safety. To work a system of executive control on the Continental pattern the English have neither the experience nor the trained staff. And yet it is impossible to suppose that England will submit to an almost unregulated railway monopoly. The present position cannot be permanent. That England shall adopt a system of State regulation on the French pattern is to me inconceivable. For my own part, and I have been forced to the conclusion with the greatest reluctance—for I cannot but think that it is much against the public interest—I can see but one outlet from the position in which English railways find themselves, and that outlet is State purchase.

W. M. Acworth.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE AGRARIAN REVOLUTION IN THE MIDDLE WEST.

BY JOSEPH B. ROSS.

It was a fundamental axiom of thinking Americans a hundred years ago that our economic well-being was thoroughly at one with our agricultural institutions. However much the founders of the American Republic may have differed on questions of political expediency and religious dogma, they were agreed upon the agricultural basis of the economic state. Even New England, with its productive fisheries and its incipient manufactures, legislated favorably to the more exclusively rural toilers throughout the colonial period. Jefferson was not unique in his estimates of the vital relations of agricultural well-being to our national growth, but only the spokesman of his time and country. In 1785 he wrote John Jay from Paris:

> "We have now lands enough to employ an infinite number of people in their cultivation. Cultivators of the earth are the most valuable citizens. They are the most vigorous, the most independent, the most virtuous, and they are tied to their country and wedded to its liberty and interests by the most lasting bonds. . . . I consider the class of artificers as the panderers of vice and the instruments by which the liberties of a country are generally overturned."

And thirty-one years later, from the quietude of his retirement at Monticello, he wrote Crawford:

> "The agricultural capacities of our country constitute its distinguishing feature; and the adapting our policy and pursuits to that is more likely to make us a numerous and happy people than the mimicry of an Amsterdam, a Hamburg or a city of London."

And with these sentiments there was practically unanimous agreement throughout the entire Atlantic coast. Even the merchants,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

who risked their fortunes to the rapidly increasing commerce of the new Republic, had their country homes and spent their leisure on their well-kept estates.

The extensive frontier which receded rapidly before the advance of the pioneers made this original idea more persistent. Beyond the Alleghenies commerce and fisheries offered no allurements, and the primitive life of the people reduced industrial occupations to simple household production. All the expectations of the early settlers of the Mississippi basin were bound up with agricultural life. The productiveness of the soil and the anticipation that the squatter claims would increase in value were the foundations of the financial visions of every one. There was, indeed, some interchange of denizens of town and country even at this time. The learned professions were recruited for the most part from the farms. The brightest of the boys became attorneys and physicians, the more seriously disposed became ministers, and the daughters of the farm ofttimes married the successful professional men and merchants of the county towns. But in this movement from the country to the town there was no depletion of the former. The large families could well dispense with the services of a son or daughter, for the younger children would be able amply to carry on the patrimonial estate and to settle adjoining claims. The chief surplus was that of persons, and by this movement of the choicest personalities to the cities and into the professions a keen and persistent sympathy between the two types of life was fostered.

The present, however, manifests a movement of personalities in our rural neighborhoods which is assuming the proportions of an agrarian revolution. The shifting of an occasional child to the city from the country home has given place to a wholesale removal of the farming classes to the cities. It is less than a score of years since a thoughtful writer called attention to the rate at which the country was being depopulated and the menace which the city was becoming to the country. The fascination of numbers has proven too magnetizing for the isolated farm-boy, and he has gone from his home and has become a part of a strange life. The subject has frequently been discussed, sometimes with alarm at the extent of the exodus, sometimes with satisfaction at this signal proof of the versatility of American genius. But there is another phase of the problem which is quite as inter-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

esting, and which promises to create a most serious situation in the very near future. For the city,—with its crowds, which are the destruction of the neighborhood spirit, and which with its changing personnel has given rise to the multiform difficulties of civic administration, and to deserted churches in what has been termed the city wilderness,—has its counterpart in the country bereft of its most virile life. The movement of population from the rural neighborhoods to the metropolises has created the city; the same movement has depopulated the country. It is no longer a movement of a surplus of individuals to an adjacent town, the seat of the county government; it is now a removal of the staid families which have given value to the neighborhood, and it is threatening a dearth of personalities in the rural districts.

The immediate seat of this revolution is the Middle West. The Atlantic States experienced an agrarian revolution during the nineteenth century, but of a very different type, and it has now spent its force. In the Eastern States the primary cause of the revolution in rural life was the exhaustion of the soil. Farms were abandoned because they had ceased to be productive. Families which had once been opulent were reduced to poverty because their landed estates refused to yield further produce. The families either remained upon their patrimonial estates, their stamina yielding as the soil, until life became a passive tragedy; or else the old homes were abandoned and their erstwhile denizens joined the great Western movement and sought to recoup their fortunes in new and more fertile lands. The present revolution in agrarian affairs which is finding expression in the Middle West is radically distinct from the agrarian revolution through which the Atlantic States have but recently passed. It is due not to soil exhaustion, but to marvellously enhanced productivity of the soil. While the people of the Eastern States were impelled to abandon their homes to obtain a livelihood, the rural habitant of the Middle West, because of a surfeit of the good things of life, is impelled to an exodus from his pristine surroundings.

Broadly speaking, the agricultural history of the Mississippi basin may be divided into three periods. In the Northern States east of the Mississippi the first period extended from about the beginning of the nineteenth century to the year 1835. Land was abundant and cheap. It could be obtained from the Government by original entry for from one dollar to five dollars an

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

acre, or from the early land speculators at from one dollar to ten dollars an acre. The greater portion of the land was owned by the original settlers, or by those who had purchased holdings from the original entrants, and it was occupied and cultivated by the owners. It was a period of landlord cultivation. A small percentage not to exceed one-tenth of the occupied land was owned by non-resident speculators. The latter were only temporarily possessed of their holdings, and were very willing to dispose of their tracts in small farms at a moderate profit over their original investments. In this period there was much wild land; few fences had been erected, roads consisted of cow-paths and blazed trails, houses were of logs, and all buildings were small and meagre. No attempt was made to place valuable improvements upon the claims, as the chief energies of the settlers were expended in clearing the land in order to render it cultivable.

The second period of agricultural development for this group of States extended approximately from 1835 to 1890. This period was characterized by a gradual amelioration of general conditions, an increase of land values and an improvement of facilities for social and economic intercourse. Land advanced from ten dollars an acre, the maximum price during the first period, to about seventy-five dollars for the choicest tracts. Practically all the land was owned by residents. Very little was possessed by non-resident speculators, though, perhaps, the same percentage of the landed area which had been held by them during the first period now was owned by residents of the towns. Farms tended to become smaller. Cultivation was pursued by the owners personally, or they directed tenants in the cultivation of the lands and received a share of the produce as rent. The tenants remained for years upon the same farm, and only gave up their tenancy when they had accumulated sufficient to purchase farms for themselves. Roads were much improved, and railroads were established from time to time which afforded convenient markets within a few miles from every farmhouse. The highways were gravelled and macadamized. Then, too, the farms were greatly improved intensively. Some attention was paid to drainage, generally by the establishment of private drains through neighborhood co-operation. But the principal consideration was given to the erection of commodious homes and ample barns for the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

comfort and well-being of the family and stock. The chief pride of the landowners was in their broad acres. They believed that of all men they were most blessed, nor would they have exchanged their lot for any other upon the earth. It was a period in which agriculture was gradually reaching a high state of development through the application of improved methods of cultivation and the use of artificial fertilizers, and in which the ambition of the rural classes was to render their lot most attractive through a lavish abundance of necessaries, and occasionally of the luxuries of existence.

About the year 1890 the second period in the agricultural history of the Middle West, and particularly of the group of States north of the Ohio and east of the Mississippi, drew to a close, and this territory entered upon a novel type of development. The second period was an evolution from the period of settlement which was natural and expected. The third period, in so far as it has already advanced, has had many of the characters of a revolution and has been unexpected. First of all, there has been a rapid advance of land values. Land has doubled, trebled and in many instances has become tenfold more valuable than at the commencement of the period. The land which in the closing years of the second period could not be disposed of for ten or twenty dollars an acre now sells readily for a hundred dollars. The higher-priced land has not risen at so rapid a rate, but it, too, has shared in the general appreciation of values. Large sums of money have been spent, and are spending, for the improvement of the land. But while in the second period these expenditures were chiefly made in building stately homes and commodious barns, in the present period they are directed almost wholly to the rendering of the land more productive and to increase the facilities for marketing the grain. Private co-operation for drainage has been succeeded by vast public enterprises, and several counties are frequently included within a single drainage district. Not only the main roads, but the minor and connecting highways, have been improved so that they may be utilized for traffic at any season of the year. Telephone lines connect farmhouses with each other and with the market towns, and the rural free delivery of mail and of the daily newspapers affords an opportunity for the most isolated household to feel the throb of the great world-life. And the rapidly multiplying system of inter-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

urban electric roads will even more thoroughly sensitize the country to the nearness and fascination of the city.

In this period farming has been commercialized. The splendid buildings which were erected for the use of the family during the second period have been suffered to fall into decay, the family having removed their permanent residence to the adjoining city. Landlord cultivation has given place to a cultivation by tenants. And in the stead of tenants who looked forward to the possibility of becoming freeholders, and who, during their career as tenants, remained upon the same tract of land or in the same neighborhood for a score of years, there has arisen a nomadic class of tenants who itinerate from farm to farm and from one neighborhood to another. Rents for a share of the produce are still quite common, but there is an increasing tendency to demand a fixed cash payment for the use of the land regardless of the productiveness of the season. The younger sons of the farmer's family have no longer an expectation some day to possess a messuage of their own. Rather do they compete with one another for the tenancy of cultivated tracts until the rents which they contract to pay are rapidly becoming ruinous. And they know that even if they should be able to accumulate a few hundred or a few thousand dollars, they cannot hope to purchase farms for themselves because of the enhanced value of the land.

The agrarian revolution which we have outlined has reached its most advanced stage of development in the group of States in the northeastern portion of the Mississippi Valley. In other parts of the Middle West this revolutionary tendency has scarcely begun, but even in its rudimentary stages it conforms to the outline of the more highly developed section which we have analyzed here in detail. Some of the States west of the Mississippi are only in the second stage of evolution; in the southwest the first stage has not yet been passed, and much of the landed property is owned by corporations which have been organized for speculative purposes. The history of the States on the west of the Mississippi has been briefer than that of their more easterly neighbors, yet there is little reason to believe that the course which has been pursued in the older States of this region will not be duplicated in all essential features in the regions which have been more recently settled.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Here, then, are the revolutionary proportions of the present agrarian exodus. The increased value of the farm holdings and the multiplied productiveness of the soil have caused the landowners to become dissatisfied with their comfortable rural homes and to long for the social life of the city. Sometimes the city, which is the Mecca of their bent, is the county town, but more often it is the neighboring metropolis. Their removal to the larger cities is primarily social, not economic. In this it differs remarkably from the movement to towns and cities which was common in the second period. And in another factor there is also a marked difference from the former migration. The migration to the cities from the rural neighborhoods during the second period was not only economic, but was a migration of individuals. The family maintained itself intact and remained on the country estate. The present migration is social and is characterized by the removal of the families from the country to the city. The economic life of the city to which the removal is made is not greatly advantaged by the new acquisition, nor is its political life improved. The serious interests and vital problems of the city are not participated in by the new residents. They receive their support from the farms which have been abandoned, and their chief reason for adopting a city residence is that they may expend their incomes for the greatest pleasurable return.

But while the experiences of the newly removed rural inhabitants to the town or city is an interesting phase of our social growth, it is rather to be studied as a phase of the development of civic life. The revolution in our agrarian life may be observed among those who have remained upon the farms, who have not yet migrated, and among the growing tenantry of our rural neighborhoods. The farmers of the Middle West for the first eighty years of the nineteenth century were the counterpart of the English yeomen of the preceding century. Strong, virile, opinionated, conscious of personal worth, with a keen interest in all questions of political and of practical religious import, withal treasuring the friendships of the neighborhood and loyal to the community life, the American in act and thought was a freeman. He was a home-builder, and his Saxon heritage impelled him constantly to make that home more winsome in its repose and more self-sufficing. Now, however, his interests have been com-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pletely changed. The country is no longer his home to be fostered in its neighborhood interests, nor is he deeply and vitally concerned in its social and political institutions. The farm is an investment and is to be tested, as every other investment, by its capacities for income production. The personnel of the country is no longer that of yeomen. A new personnel has developed, created by the new economic conditions. The thoughts, purposes, interests of the new personages, are distinct from those who preceded them. And the result will soon be an entirely new adjustment of social, political and economic life.

All unperceived has this vast change been inaugurated and even assumed large and menacing proportions. So deeply engrossed have we been in the growth of industrial institutions and in the increase of civic communities, and so confident have we been in the persistent integrity of the country, that few have awakened to the problems created by the agrarian revolution. And upon first thought it is difficult to observe any reason for disquietude. A drive through the country districts evidences that every farm is in a high state of cultivation. The fences are well kept, the produce is abundant, the highways are improved. It is only upon minute inquiry that one may discover the changes in the rural personnel which we have mentioned. But if one should take the trouble to canvass any well-appearing and prosperous rural community, he would find that entire neighborhoods of rural landowners had yielded to the attractions of the towns and cities, and that for miles the country is possessed of tenantry. Upon a further inquiry it would be found that many of the tenants have been occupying the lands which they are now cultivating but a brief time: from one to three years; that they are bound in many cases to pay a fixed rental in cash, and that most of them expect within a short time to leave their present leaseholds and remove to some place not far distant, where the terms of rental will be less severe. A searching analysis of rural conditions will reveal still further that this vast change of rural personnel is a matter which has occurred within the past fifteen years, and that the chief exodus of landowners has taken place since the beginning of the present century. Thus it would be found that from 1890 to 1898 the movement of the rural landowners from the country to the town decidedly increased over the previous period. With the year 1898, at the close of the financial

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

panic, the movement became more decidedly obvious, and from 1902 to 1909 entire neighborhoods have removed within a few months. It is difficult to determine precisely the extent of this social readjustment, but I believe it might be stated approximately that the removals from the country to the city from 1890 until 1898 were twice as numerous as during the preceding decade; that from 1898 until 1902 the removals exceeded the previous ten years, and that the rate of removal has again doubled within the past five years. These estimates have been made from a careful analysis of several representative rural communities and cannot be far from right.

And it must not be overlooked that it is the wealthier communities that are affected, and within these several communities it is the wealthier and more progressive families that are migrating from the rural neighborhoods. Within a county one township may be composed for the most part of small farms and have an almost exclusive landlord cultivation. Here the personnel is persistent and affords few suggestions of change. Yet not more than ten miles distant, where larger estates are common, the city migration is most evidently in full movement. The readjustment, then, is social in its causes; but it creates not only social, but important economic problems as consequences. And while the dangers are not immediately at hand, we cannot but think that within a short time the problem of the country will be as menacing to the national welfare as the problem of the city has become. Many of the dangers, however, can only be anticipated at the present time.

The most immediate effect of these changes in the rural personnel may be observed in the country churches. The church for many centuries has been almost the exclusive social centre of the rural communities. The lack of facilities for communication made small neighborhoods the rule, and each community of a few miles in extent had its preaching-place. Sometimes the religious services were held in church buildings, sometimes the rural schools were utilized, but in either case the attendance was always large. The churches had been established with the first settlement of the country; their exclusive position as centres of social interests had attached all hearts to them. Families had grown up with the strongest feelings of loyalty for this local ecclesiasticism, fathers and mothers had been buried in the church-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

yard, children had been baptized at the altar of this local place of worship, and at each service-time the vehicles of every household were by the church door. The leading and well-established families took a prominent part in the church attendance and services and seldom yielded place to any newcomer. These leading families were the supporters of the church and the directors of the Sunday-school. Their deepest attachments in the neighborhood life, next to their personal welfare, were to the church. They found great satisfaction in the beauty of the church edifice and in the prosperous condition of the church's financial affairs. But it is such representative families as we have depicted that have removed to the towns and cities. For a time the old church fellowship is remembered and occasional visits are made to the rural home, that the family may again worship in the cherished sanctuary, but these visits become less frequent after a few years and finally cease. By these removals the churches have been deprived of their chief financial support, and the communities have lost the leading participators in their religious activities.

The new families who have moved into the neighborhood to cultivate the land do not in any degree fill these vacancies. Many reasons conjoin to make this impossible. The newcomers are landless and often very poor. Their only wealth consists of farming implements which are capable of easy removal from place to place. The country neighborhood is the most conservative type of community life and resents the intrusion of the strange face. And when the intruder is also landless, any attempt upon his part to assume neighborhood leadership by activity in the church is opposed. For the rural habitant has learned, through long experience, to associate personal worth with landed possessions and with staid and permanent residence in the community. Every element of personal worthiness, according to accustomed standards, is lacking in the newcomers, and while they are permitted to attend the house of worship, if they wish to live in even tolerable amity with their neighbors they must not be too assertive. Possibly a longer residence of the tenantry might modify this *régime,* but the commercial basis of the new agriculture makes this impossible, and after a few years the tenant removes elsewhere and a still newer face is seen. Meanwhile the duties of supporting the rural church weigh more and more heavily upon the diminishing number of landowners who

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

have not yet removed to the towns. Contributions for religious purposes never have been large, or in any degree proportioned to the wealth of the several communities, and the support of the church always has been a burden to the people. Now, however, the burden has become arduous. The tenants who have succeeded the old body of resident landowners contribute practically nothing toward the support of the church. At the beginning of their farming year they are without financial means and even obtain their supplies of groceries and of clothing upon credit until their harvest may permit of payment. Then when the grain is ready for marketing, the accounts which have been incurred for the family necessities must be paid, and after that little remains. And if the lease cannot be renewed for another year the small savings in the family exchequer is husbanded to pay the expenses incident to a removal to a new abode. Indeed, the tenants not only fail to contribute toward the support of the rural churches, but seldom attend religious services at all. And thus the churches are weakened in their financial support, and at the same time the attendance is considerably lessened. Finally the neighborhood becomes unable to support the church as formerly, and instead of regular preaching services pastors are discharged, the church joins with another in a contiguous neighborhood which is suffering in like manner, and the two congregations struggle to accomplish what had heretofore been an easy task for either.

This course has actually been pursued in many different places in the Middle West. Whether it will afford a satisfactory solution of the problem of the rural church remains to be seen. But that it is actually the experience through which the country church is passing needs only a casual examination of the statistics of any of our religious bodies to verify. The strongest religious denomination in the Middle West, both in numbers of communicants and in the wealth of its membership, is the Methodist Episcopal Church. The custom of this church in the country neighborhoods to which it ministers is to unite several weak local congregations into what are called circuits. If two churches form a circuit they are ministered to alternately: sometimes the ministrations are conducted at the one place Sunday morning and at the other Sunday evening, or the Sundays are alternated between the two places. When four churches are united, a single service is devoted to each of the congregations once in each fort-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

night. The annual statistics published by the Methodist Episcopal Church abundantly verify the views expressed in this essay and are a most important commentary upon our present agrarian revolution. The general tendency of the churches of this denomination in the Middle West east of the Mississippi during what we have termed the second period of agricultural development was to begin on the large circuit plan with religious ministrations once a month or once a fortnight. The circuits would gradually decrease in extent and finally many rural neighborhoods were able alone to support a resident pastor and to have regular religious ministrations. From 1890 to 1895 the development of rural churches was most remarkable. Every year the conferences were called upon to readjust the circuits and stations, as the several preaching appointments were called, and more and more the rural neighborhoods were demanding resident pastors. But by the year 1898 all this was changed. And by 1900 the newly formed stations or single churches which were capable of supporting resident ministers unaided were joined into groups or circuits again. Instead of circuits being divided as heretofore, and each being made the gainer in larger ministrations to the neighborhood religious life, circuits were united. And a large surplus of clergymen were driven into secular life in order that they might obtain a livelihood.

Other denominations have had a like experience. Churches once strong and vigorous have been weakened and weaker churches have been abandoned. The religious conditions have not yet become universally desperate, but we are indicating tendencies, and one of the most marked in the rural life of the Middle West is that which is threatening the destruction of the rural church.

Not so evident as the effect of the agrarian revolution upon the rural religious life is its influence on the social and economic interests of these communities. The second and third periods through which the rural West has passed, or is passing, are both characterized by large improvements. In the second period the improvements were directed toward making the farm more comfortable and a fitter place of residence. It was an era for the building of large houses and barns. In the third period the improvements are made for more purely economic ends. They are intended to make the farms more productive. Smaller houses are erected and they have few conveniences. The chief expendi-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tures are now made for the draining of the land and for the erecting of adequate fences. The conception of the farm as a home has given way to that of the farm as an investment. In the second period rural social life was greatly enriched. The church was the chief social centre and its course we have already depicted. But in other ways social experience was becoming broader and more varied. Families began to subscribe for daily newspapers instead of the weekly and monthly sheets which they had taken before. Magazines also were found upon the tables of the well-to-do families in the country. Ladies formed literary and social clubs and met in turn at their several homes. Table appointments were marked by increasing wealth and culture. Cheap colored glass and plated ware was succeeded by cut glass and sterling silver. A trip to Florida or to California for the winter was of too frequent occurrence to occasion remark. There are many communities in the Middle West which have not as yet succumbed to the townward trend and in which the social life is varied and attractive. But in the neighborhoods which have already passed into the third stage of our agricultural development and which in every instance are the neighborhoods most progressive and wealthy—all of these marks of the growing intrinsic richness of social experience have passed or are passing. The rural home now is a tenement of a few rooms situated on a corner of the farm, or else a few rooms in the rear of the great mansion are devoted to the use of the tenant and his family. In the latter case, the greater part of the farm residence is locked so that the tenant cannot enter. In these homes magazines are never taken; newspapers are sometimes subscribed for, but more generally are begged at the neighboring town on market day. These tenants seldom make calls upon their neighbors and social gatherings are limited to occasions of sickness and death. Table appointments are meagre, and again the chief diversion of rural life is the weekly trip to the county-seat. The social experience in rural communities is fast recurring to a type which was prevalent from thirty to fifty years ago, with this great difference: that then it marked a stage of social advancement and was common throughout the country, while now it indicates social degeneration and is a consequence of tenant farming.

The educational institutions of our rural communities are likewise affected. Schoolhouses had been built in convenient locali-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ties and were well attended. This is still true in neighborhoods which have not been greatly affected by the agrarian changes we are emphasizing in this essay. There has been some tendency to unite schools, however, closing many and having two or three in a township to which all of the children are transported in wagons at the public expense. But we must not overlook important factors in this change of educational scheme. The movement toward centralization of rural schools is most advanced in our wealthier communities—that is, in the communities which are rapidly being given over to the tenantry. The present tenants of the great farms have fewer children than the landlord families which preceded them in occupancy of the farms, and the necessity of the rural schools has decidedly lessened. And while the desire for fewer schools and greater efficiency of the teaching force has had large influence, the movement toward centralization of schools has been accelerated by the present agrarian revolution.

Then, too, the end of the community existence has been changed. The rural community is following the lead of the city in losing the home feeling. The old home existed largely for the sake of the community and sought to render the community life more attractive. The family expected to remain in the neighborhood forever; the fathers and mothers chose plots in the churchyard in which to be buried; the sons and daughters looked forward to the establishment of homes as near their birthplace as possible. The succeeding tenant habitant has no such sentimental regard for the neighborhood. He has lived in the community for a year or two, but is willing to remove elsewhere upon the assurance of a better farm or a less stringent lease. His possession of his present leasehold is precarious, as his lease is generally for a single year and seldom for a greater term than three years. He is watching constantly for an opportunity to better his material circumstances, and this expectation is necessarily associated with the idea of removal from his present abode. So his attachment to the community is as precarious as his tenancy. It has no permanent interest in him, nor has he in the community. And the sole tie which holds them together even temporarily is their mutual financial profit.

The influence of the agrarian revolution upon political affairs is not yet felt. The revolutionary changes have scarcely proceeded far enough for these effects to become manifest. We can, there-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fore, only anticipate their probable consequences. The landlord yeomanry which gave so distinct and positive a character to rural life in the Middle West had strong political predilections. Like their prototypes in England, their chief interests, beyond their immediate necessities for a livelihood, were in governmental affairs. The leading men of the neighborhood sought the township offices and occasionally claimed local support in candidacy for a county office. In the commercial tenancy which is fast developing, we can see no promise that this splendid yeoman spirit will persist. The tenants themselves cannot become candidates for public office because of the uncertainty of their tenure, for they can give no guarantee that they will be permanent members of the local political life. The landlord cultivators are constantly and rapidly decreasing, and within a few years the men of strong and virile character will have given up farming as a personal occupation. The residue of landlord cultivators will be a class of small proprietors who have no decided opinions on any question, political, religious or economic.

From a present examination of rural conditions, it would appear that agricultural life in the Middle West is rapidly nearing a stage of development which has many resemblances to the factory life of the manufacturing towns. In the latter there is a large body comprising the entire manual toiling-class, who are held together by an economic bond. They live contiguously to one another, they are all dependent for their livelihoods upon precarious contracts of employment, they have no vital interest in the enterprises in which they are engaged beyond the wage which they receive, and upon their discharge from their present employment they expect to migrate to some distant place where they may again obtain wage-earning positions of the same kind they now have. Now all of these phenomena are appearing in the life of the rural tenant class which is rapidly developing. They do not migrate so far as do the wage-earners of the manufacturing towns, but the removal is quite as real. In every other regard their experiences suggest kindred phenomena to those which have developed to such menacing proportions in the manufacturing centres of the country.

The present crisis in rural life presents a most serious problem for solution. The safeguard of the country has always been its home life and its neighborhood attachments. Upon the recent

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

growth of large cities and the segregation of industrial enterprises in communities which have been called manufacturing towns the political, religious and social life of the nation was gravely menaced. The problem of the city has thus far failed to be even approximately solved. But in the face of increasing perplexities caused by the difficulties of municipal administration, by the weakening of churches and religious influences, by the sundering of social ties and the destruction of family and neighborhood restraints, the chief reliance of all serious thinkers has been upon the virile American of our rural communities. There was a supreme confidence that, however the larger aggregations of society in cities might complicate the problems of Government and jeopardize the social welfare there could be no serious danger because of the ameliorating tendencies of rural life. Now, however, this safeguard is dissipated. The agrarian revolution which is assuming alarming proportions in the more highly developed sections of the Middle West, and is rapidly spreading throughout the Mississippi Valley, is the rural phase of the tremendous social upheaval which for a third of a century has been revolutionizing our urban life. What the ultimate consequences of the agrarian revolution may be I do not venture to suggest. What will be the combined effect of the problem of the city as it has developed for thirty years, becoming more and more inexplicable as time has passed, and the problem of the country as it is developing at so accelerated a rate, demands the most serious thought of our public-minded citizens. And the combined problems constitute a dangerous menace to our New World civilization.

JOSEPH B. ROSS.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE UNREST IN INDIA.

BY SIR HENRY COTTON, K.C.S.I., M.P.

THE cause of the unrest in India is well known and can be briefly stated. It is due, on the one hand, to the growing demand for greater power and influence in the control and management of their own affairs among the educated classes of the Indian community, and, on the other, to the systematic rejection of that demand by those who are responsible for the government of the country. The situation is a critical one, but there is nothing in it that need cause surprise. It was inevitable that, with the spread of education and Western civilization among the people, new ideas and new aspirations should spring into life; and it was also a matter of equally assured certainty—the limitations of human nature being what they are—that a handful of white men, accustomed to the exercise of autocratic rule over a colored population, would resist to the utmost any and every tendency to encroach on the privileges of their position.

In this deadlock we find the kernel of the unrest which, broadly speaking, expresses itself in two directions. One is in the growth of a popular passion towards a national and patriotic instinct manifested primarily on political lines aiming at Home Rule and self-government, but also affected by economic considerations put forward in favor of domestic industries and opposed to any form of foreign exploitation of the country. The other is the growth of a racial feeling—antagonistic, hostile, bitter—of which there is ample evidence on both sides, tending, not only to obstruct harmonious coöperation between the rulers and the ruled, but to present an insuperable barrier to friendly relations.

The spirit of discontent discloses itself in an infinite variety of developments; but underlying the grievance, which, while it may be one thing or another, is always the consciousness and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

conviction that the control of public affairs by foreign hands is exercised in a manner differing from and contrary to the desires and wishes of the people affected by it.

Take the case of the Punjab, which has attracted considerable attention in Great Britain. The Punjab is comparatively a backward province from the educational point of view, and it would in ordinary circumstances afford a very barren field for the propagation of the new ideas and methods of thought which find more congenial encouragement elsewhere. But the barren soil has been fertilized by much discontent. The grievance in that province was occasioned by heavy increase in land taxation, and especially by arbitrary procedure in connection with the enforcement of water rates and the colonization of waste lands brought under cultivation by the extension of irrigation. The climax was reached by the introduction into the Legislative Council of a Colonization Bill which gave effect to a number of measures strongly resented by the colonists. Those colonists are for the most part an ignorant class of people, but it so happens that they furnish to the Indian army some of its most valuable soldiers. They had no mouthpiece among themselves to represent their grievances, but they speedily found spokesmen among the educated members of the community. The Colonization Bill was vehemently opposed in every constitutional way; but, in spite of all opposition, it passed into law, and with the more haste because, as the Lieutenant-Governor foolishly declared from his place in Council, any delay in legislation would only encourage the agitation. Public meetings were held in which the colonists were harangued by agitators; speeches more or less seditious in their character were made, and disturbances followed. Then the Government took action. Prosecutions were instituted, newspaper editors were sent to jail, and Lajpat Rai and Ajit Singh, whose names are now well known in England, were arrested and deported without charge or trial under the provisions of an old Regulation of 1819. The province was in a ferment, and lively excitement naturally extended to all parts of India. But, at this stage, the Government took steps which should certainly have been adopted in the first instance. They proceeded to remove the causes of the discontent. Remissions of the land tax were allowed, water rates were reduced, and, above all, the Viceroy refused to allow the provisions of the Coloniza-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion Bill to come into operation. The immediate result of these measures was to restore quiet to the country. It has been affirmed that this restoration of peace and order was due to the extraordinary measures taken for the punishment of offenders, and especially to the deportation of Lajpat Rai and Ajit Singh. Those may believe this who will. The simplest application of common sense will attribute the effect produced to its obvious antecedent. That there is still any unrest in the Punjab is due to the protracted prosecutions which are still going on, and to arrests which are still being made. The Punjab is not free from racial bitterness or from that passion for nationality to which reference has been made, but it is not in this direction that there has been any popular movement in that province. There were specific and particular grievances of which the local leaders of the national movement skilfully availed themselves, and the importance of the agitation was entirely due to the alarm of the Government that the native troops were affected by it. In the action taken it is easy to recognize the powerful hand of Lord Kitchener as the dominating influence. The evil wrought lies in the high-handed, arbitrary and vindictive measures adopted, which have stimulated in an unprecedented degree the general unrest which is simmering in all parts of India.

In Bengal the circumstances are very different. There is no province in India which has hitherto been more docile and law-abiding than Bengal. But it is the province in which English education and Western ideas have been most largely disseminated, and where the strongest desire has naturally grown up among the people for representation in the Government and a wider and more practical share in the administration of their own affairs. It is also the province where the greatest contempt has been shown for public opinion and popular aspirations. It is in Bengal, therefore, that manifestations of popular discontent have found their most ample outlet. The causes of discontent there are innumerable, but it is not necessary to mention more than two or three of them. The dial of local self-government has been set back in Calcutta; a system of nomination to Government service has been substituted for competitive examinations; popular institutions have been discouraged; unaided schools have been hampered and fettered; and all branches of education, including the University, have been officialized. Above all, there is the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

recent partition of Bengal, which was not only carried out in direct opposition to the wishes of the people and in spite of their most vigorous protests, but was enforced with every degree of harshness and want of sympathy.

The wide-reaching effect of this measure on the national movement in India calls for particular notice. It is not necessary to discuss the administrative reasons put forward for its justification. The scheme of partition naturally commended itself to the members of the Government service who saw before them an attractive vista of additional officers and emoluments. But it was repugnant in the extreme to the inhabitants of the country, in whom there is a sense of patriotic pride in their province, their ancestry and their future. The partition of Bengal cuts the Bengalee nation into two parts, according to a purely arbitrary line. It is based on no ethnical distinctions, and follows no ancient frontier. It divides a province which has been united from the earliest times known to history. It necessitates a decision on the part of two separate administrations, and of two separate legislatures, on every question concerning the Bengalee people — their land system, their municipal system, their taxation, their police, their communications and their education. It means the disruption of the nation politically and socially. It is small wonder that the people did not submit to it. The object of the measure was to shatter the unity and to disintegrate the feelings of solidarity which are established in the province. It was no administrative reason that lay at the root of the scheme. It was part and parcel of Lord Curzon's policy to enfeeble the growing power and destroy the political tendencies of a patriotic spirit. Bengalees are the leaders of political agitation in modern India. With all their faults, they are the principal section of the community which has inspired the future hope and destiny of their country. The consciousness and conviction that the partition was designed to weaken Bengalee influence added intensity to the popular irritation on the subject. The measure was carried through against the will of the people. They held more than a thousand meetings and demonstrations; their local press was unanimous; they made every variety of representation; they exhausted the resources of constitutional agitation. But all their protests were ignored and treated with contempt. At last they fell back on new methods, which resulted

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in the organization of a movement for the encouragement of national manufactures and industries and the prevention, by every legitimate means, of the importation and consumption of foreign goods. It was hoped that this form of agitation would operate on Englishmen through their pockets, and so induce public opinion to influence the Government to pay some regard to local wishes in Bengal. This hope, it is needless to say, has not been fulfilled. But the movement has displayed remarkable vitality. In spite of official opposition of every kind, accompanied in many cases by persecution of individuals and attempts at forcible repression, it has held its own. It has spread to the other Presidencies. It is still in its infancy and has need of the application of capital to back it. It was inevitable that its supporters should bring themselves within the meshes of the law, but they have outlived persecution. It has led to intolerable friction between the officials and the people, but it is a permanent outcome of the partition. The movement is intensely national in character, and is the most practical and visible form in which the national tendencies of the country find their present expression.

Side by side with the official attitude of antagonism to this movement, is the sinister attempt, which has been made by the authorities in India, to fan the religious friction which is unfortunately an inherent element in a country where Hindoos and Mohammedans are mingled among one another in varying numbers. In India generally, the number of Hindoos vastly preponderates over that of Mohammedans, but in Eastern Bengal the followers of Islam constitute an actual majority of the population. In other parts of India, Mohammedans are more or less of foreign extraction, and there is a strain of Arab or Mogul blood in their veins. But in Eastern Bengal they are almost all comparatively recent converts from among the lower castes and poorer classes of the people. They are of the same race and blood as the Hindoos, and these have for many generations lived together on the most friendly terms. No trace of hostility was ever found there under normal conditions. But the element of strife was kindled by the unfortunate partition of the Bengal Province, one of the avowed objects of which was to strengthen and revive Mohammedan interests and aspirations—a legitimate and praiseworthy object in itself, but not at the cost of national

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

disunion. The consequence has been seen in an outbreak of fanaticism which resulted in riots and disorder in many portions of the province. During these troublous times the local authorities failed to display that impartiality which has hitherto been a distinguishing feature of Indian administration, and have incurred the just reprobation of the highest judicial court in Calcutta for the anti-Hindoo bias they have manifested. But the evil has been done. Dissensions have arisen where they never previously existed; and, although among the rising generation there are signs of a common feeling in favor of the brotherly coöperation of the two great communities, a sullen sense of distrust and resentment remains.

Such, then, have been the direct results of the partition of Bengal, which can only be described as one of the greatest administrative blunders ever perpetrated by the British Government in India. The unrest in Bengal has found an echo in every part of the country; and, aided by other causes on which there is no space to dwell, it has afforded an impetus to the national movement of incalculable force. But in Bengal, unlike the Punjab, no steps have been taken to remove the causes of discontent. The native army is not recruited from Bengal, and that single fact is sufficient to explain the difference of policy. The partition has not been modified, and no concession has been made to Bengalee unrest. The present condition of affairs in that province shows no symptom of improvement. The police have been strengthened and jail accommodation has been extended, but there has been a distinct loss of efficiency in every department. There has arisen a bitterness of feeling between the officials, on the one hand, and the educated classes, on the other, which has aggravated the situation almost to the breaking-point. Press prosecutions and the incarceration and flogging of individuals for political agitation are of every-day occurrence, and a persistent policy of repression and coercion is maintaining the popular excitement at fever pitch.

It is unnecessary to dwell on the position in the other Presidencies. In Bombay there is great discontent and irritation. Demonstrations of unparalleled magnitude have been held there. But there has been no violence as yet. Madras is disturbed and unsettled in sympathy with the feeling in other parts of India, and outbreaks have occurred which have been rigorously repressed.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The public press and opinion in all parts of India strike a unanimous note and reflect the feeling in Bengal.

The unsympathetic response which has been made to popular demands, and the official attitude of coercion and repression deliberately assumed are at the root of the discontent and unrest and impatience of the British connection with the country which is the most ominous cloud upon the horizon of Indian politics. There is now a party of Indian nationalists who despair of constitutional agitation, and openly advocate the establishment of an absolutely free and independent form of national government in India. Their aim is to sever the connection between England and India altogether and at the shortest notice. Their object is to propagate a violent anti-British agitation, and by any means in their power to make British rule impossible in India. These men are a shadow of danger which casts itself over the future. A few years ago, there was the possibility of the rise of such a party which has sprung into life as a consequence of a policy which, while concentrating itself on efficiency on purely bureaucratic lines, has proceeded in complete disregard of the wishes and feelings of the people affected. But the members of this party are still in a minority. Their powers are rapidly increasing and recent events have given an unprecedented stimulus to the cause they advocate. If the present policy of the Government continues, there is too much reason to fear that they will become a majority. But they are not yet in that position. The recognized leaders of Indian thought and the original pioneers of the national movement are still unaffected by any symptoms of alienation from the British Government. They are men of moderate views. Their ideal is not separation from Great Britain. They desire to obtain self-government and the detailed management of their own affairs. Their ideal is that India may ultimately be placed in a position corresponding to that of the self-governing colonies of the Empire. They look forward to the future of India as a federation of united states, cemented together under the authority of England. That is the ideal which they hold before them, knowing well that it can only be realized gradually and cautiously and as the result of time and experience.

The practical difficulty with which the Government of India is immediately confronted is the impatience of the extreme section of the community. The danger is that, by too tardy an acknowl-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

edgment of the changes which are taking place in India, the British may drive the educated classes to force their opportunity before the country is ripe for such a consummation. At times of crisis, difficulties settle themselves roughly; and those who have not advanced beyond the transition period will always be apt to be borne away by the violence of the stream. At such a moment, true statesmanship will be evinced, not only by care and caution, but also by wise encouragement. The difficulty is one which may be overcome if the members of the Government of India associate themselves with the leaders of Indian thought. These leaders possess immense power and influence; and, if the Government act with them and through them and not against them, the disturbing tendencies of the extreme party will speedily subside. There is no danger in this course. The leaders of the Indian movement are not yet borne away by the enthusiasm of their followers. The formation of an extreme Left among their own party is as embarrassing to them as to the Government. Their faith in British honor and integrity is firm and strong, albeit it has been shaken by recent events. They are grateful for the education with which they have been endowed, for the liberties they enjoy, and for their immunity from foreign invasion. But their gratitude is tempered by a feeling that the pledges held out to them have not been fulfilled, and a sense of disappointment rapidly rising into bitterness has been kindled amongst them. It is because their claims have been disregarded, their prayers rejected, and their coöperation spurned, that the present difficulties have arisen.

Unfortunately, true statesmanship is rare; and at this crisis the Government of India, with the approval of Mr. Morley, the Secretary of State, have put forward certain schemes of administrative reform in the hope that they will tend to alleviate the popular unrest. Mr. Morley has himself appointed two natives of India to his own Council at the India Office. This would have been a wise measure if these gentlemen had been in any degree representatives of progressive Indian opinion. But they are not. The one is a retired Hindoo official who is saturated with officialism, and the other is a Mohammedan who has passed a long service in the employment of the Nizam of Hyderabad. Both are men of eminent respectability, but neither can ever become the mouthpiece in Council of modern Indian thought.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A Royal Commission has been appointed to inquire into the relations now existing between the Government of India and the various Provincial Governments, and between the Provincial Governments and the authorities subordinate to them, with a view of reporting whether by decentralizing authority their relations can be improved. But all authority in India is despotic, the Provincial Governments are petty despotisms, and every delegation of authority is calculated to deprive the people of that exercise of control and check and right of appeal which they regard as a great privilege and safeguard. Sanction has been accorded to the appointment of an Advisory Council of Notables in India. This is a good measure in itself, but it does not go very far, and its weakness lies in the fact that these territorial magnates of whom the Council is to consist represent neither the people nor the educated classes of the community. Lastly, it is in contemplation to enlarge the Legislative Councils, subject to the maintenance of an official majority. This, too, is a step in the right direction; but the proposals are vitiated by the constitution of the enlarged Council, which provides not only for a large increase in the number of official members and for the special representation of Mohammedans, of commerce, and of the landed interest, but raises the elective franchise and affords no addition to the number of elected members.

It need hardly be said that these measures are wholly inadequate to meet the exigencies of the existing situation. In many respects they are retrograde; for, relatively speaking, the representation of the educated community on the reformed Councils of Government will be even less than it is at present. They have been received with a chorus of disappointment from the Indian press. The acute and well-trained intellect of Indian publicists has showered upon them a flood of hostile criticism. Here is one specimen:

"In this scheme we find the usual official representation, that is the appointment or nomination of men whose duties will consist in the defence of official practice and procedure, of official blunders and misgovernment; there is the representation of the ruling chiefs, anxious for honors and salutes; of commercial interests anxious to levy countervailing duties on coarse cotton goods, to provide unlimited funds for railway construction and rolling stock, and exploit the country with foreign capital to the exclusion of our own countrymen; there is the representation of landholders and notabilities, anxious to support

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

proposals for personal aggrandizement at the expense of their tenants; there is the representation of Mohammedans, anxious to create a division between the two great sections of the Indian community; finally there is the representation of special interests and minorities who have hitherto remained unrepresented. But the greatest interest in the land—the interest of the masses—has been ignored."

Here is another from a somewhat different but equally effective point of view:

"The effect of the proposed reforms will be to set class against class and weaken the growing influence of the educated classes in the legislative councils. Their influence in the country is bound to grow and it cannot, indeed, be curtailed by any action that the Government may take. These reforms, therefore, when carried out will bring the Government into sharper conflict with the educated classes. Having little or no voice in the administration or in the making of the laws, their opposition to the Government will be keener than before, stimulated by the consciousness of a grave wrong done to their class."

And here is a third which briefly summarizes public opinion in its most contemptuous and decisive aspect:

"Until Mr. Morley frees India from the nightmare of executive tyranny, people are hardly disposed to attach even a featherweight of importance to his academic reforms."

Here we have the case stated in a nut-shell. While a policy of vigorous coercion is being pursued, the people of India are in no mood to listen to any schemes of this character. Every hour the party of discontent grows in strength, and the power and influence of the moderate section of Indian opinion perceptibly diminishes. It was Lord Randolph Churchill who once told us that remedial measures which we planted under the shadow of coercion must be, from their nature, poor and sickly plants of foreign origin, almost foredoomed to perish before they begin to grow. Truer words were never uttered; and it is a gloomy reflection and the bitter irony of fate that, with a Liberal Government in England in power, and with Mr. Morley, the champion of philosophic Liberalism, as Secretary of State, there should be, not only no improvement in the position or prospect of Indian affairs, but a positive aggravation of unrest and anxiety and no feature of encouragement in the outlook.

HENRY COTTON.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

TO A GREEK HEAD CALLED APHRODITE.

(In the Museum of Fine Arts at Boston.)

BY MRS. SCHUYLER VAN RENSSELAER.

Cold is the day, a northern day and darkly cold,
The daylight drowned in snow.
The singer heeds not, for his eyes and heart behold
Beauty's high lamp aglow.

Thou lovely waif from mellower time and clime than ours,
Give ear to his low plea:
Grant him a breath from the one field that bore such flowers—
Thy prototype and thee.

Not Aphrodite, though they name thee so.
Thine eyes are misted crescent moons below
The white cloud of thy brow,
But hers are stars—clear and elate
Like the bright Twins that once were Leda's sons,
Or passionate
As Betelgeuze and Bellatrix of martial name
Who in his shoulders flame
Where the huge Hunter through the midnight runs.
Her lips are tools of destiny:
Forever newly they accord, refuse, invite
Deep dangers of delight;
Thine but imagine tremulously.
And, many though her moods, she knoweth not the one
That woos us to this stone
Wherein thou livest passionless,
Immortal in a vision-haunted wistfulness.

Not Aphrodite, nor of race divine
Another bidding worship such as mine

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Come never nearer than the dust beneath her tread.
A girl from golden years long dead,
A maid unknown, unnamèd, here survives,
Rescued in this
Fair chrysalis
From a far ruined world whose shore
Shows dense with formless shadows of lost lives,
Lost and forevermore forgot, forevermore.

Thou, only, saved!—and yet not thou, not thou!
Only the line
Of cheek and brow,
The curves of eyelid, lip, and chin,
The delicate languor of the head's incline,
The rippling of the soft and heavy hair;
And, shrined their purity within,
Veiled and elusive yet imperishably there,
In reverence to be read as on some sacred scroll,
The signet-markings of the soul.

How shall we trace the clue to thy sweet mystery?
We fancy thee as one who grieves
For the soft stirring of gray olive leaves
And yellow jonquils underneath the olive tree,
And for the high clear lines of shaft and architrave,
For lifted walls serene in beauty won
From chiselled form and pattern, brave
With brazen shields where break the arrows of the sun.
A first quick fancy! But we know,
Shut here in arid walls beneath a cold
And alien sky,
Thou art not yearning for the land
Thy home. For even as we to-day behold
And worship, even so
His eyes beheld whose hand
From exquisite flesh that needs must die
To marble of immortality
Transferred thy spirit while were thine
Olive, acanthus, laurel, and the vine
In varying companionship accordant met,
Far hills' unchanging rhythm of undulate line

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

And changing rhapsodies of purple hue,
And shining fanes on bare and sunny headlands set
Between the darker and the paler blue.

Not these the loadstone of thy wishful gaze.
Now, even as when the sculptor sought in thee
A guide to beauty's verity,
Inward it turns always.
And who shall follow? Where the path
Into the sanctuary of a soul that hath
The walls of pilèd centuries for guard?
Long have I loved and pondered; keeping patient watch
Long have I waited, as though unawares to catch
A voice soft-whispering beneath
The impenetrable sheath
Marmorean. And I hear no word.
I only know that in thine own heart lay
The clouds that dimmed for thee the brilliance of the day.
Not throes of empire shadowed thus the joyousness
Of thy young years; not cities' leaguered long distress,
Lost armies, argosies a-wreck, or heroes' fate
Crushed to a splendid death by their own glory's weight.

The hurt we know not, but we know
Never it pierced, the shield of innocence below,
To the immaculate deep core of maidenhood.
Thy rosaries
Of fond remembering with but pearls are strung;
The roses of delight whereon thy longings brood
Thy virgin vision sees
Unsullied lily-fields among.
—Ay, but they budded once in crimson wealth to blow
And fervent fragrance, all ungarnered though they died.
Not thine a claustral chastity
That had denied
To answering love its happy seignory.
Not by thine own free choosing was withheld
The passionate whole
Of woman's dower; not thine own will but fate
Implacable thy feet compelled
To turn thee from the gate

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Of motherhood, to the enkindled soul
Refused the body's mate,
And bade the stirred heart live—ah, how reluctantly!—
Betrothed forever to virginity.

How are we parted, thou and I! What miles of space,
What irretraceable far miles of time,
Dissever from thy face
The eyes that crave so to have seen its living prime!
Even the pole-star, to our sense
Symbol and proof of permanence,
Hath journeyed, so were multiplied the years,
Unto the pilot place
He held not for seafarers of thy race;
And on the scintillant highway of the zodiac
The sun hath tired and fallen back;
No longer he appears,
Punctual, in the appointed star-framed houses where,
When ancient wisdom sought him there
As solstice or as equinox returned,
His dazzling signal burned.

Thou art the elder by how much! Yet young, so young—
As though the birds of dawn had by thy cradle sung
When I long since had learned to bear
The burdens of the laboring day. So long,
Long dead! Yet still a woman-child among
The living generations, and alive
With such an animate flame as shall survive
When we who breathe to-day are in our turn
Tenants of perished graves; ay sure—
Voiceless and yet how eloquent!—
Ageless, unaltering, to endure
Till unborn centuries shall of thy witness learn
Not time but beauty is the arm plenipotent.

And now, to-day, leaning thine ear
So gently, it must be that thou canst hear
How I, wandering singer, plead to thee.
Quicken my timid minstrelsy:
Show me in dreams what memories hold thy long

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

And tender gazing,
That, woven in my song,
They thrill it to a tenderer phrasing;
Let visions of thy visions of young love
To purest cadences my passion move;
Interpret the sweet patience of such pain
As stirs to ardencies of love again;
Interpret innocence, and youth, and April's breath,
The powerlessness of time, the impotence of death.
To the high deities for my sake pray
Who choose and use us as they will: prevail that they
With joys and tears prepare the seed-beds of my heart,
Winnow with chastening winds the harvests of my soul,
Touch my chill lips with the white coal
Of truth, and clarify my sight
Upward to follow where the guiding light
Streams from the torch of art.

So shall I sing, albeit with muted notes, as sing
Celestial clear
The musical fair meanings of thy face;
So to the eye, the ear,
Of spirits straying in a dumb and darkened place
My melody shall bring
Echoes, if only faint and far,
Of brooks and birds and sun-rays of the spring;
So shall it lave them in a halcyon air,
Lead them with banners as of moon and morning star;
Lull them to rest;
In the numb breast
Unseal the fountains of emotion;
Soothe the tempestuous mood
And quell
The headstrong insurrection of the blood
With balm of poesy's ablution,
And the sure anodyne
Of harp-strings touched to chords that tell
What thou hast told this burning heart of mine,
Daughter of earth and voice of the divine!

M. G. Van Rensselaer.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NEW BOOKS REVIEWED.

ESSAYS.

We have been told by one of our critical weeklies that Francis Thompson's "Shelley"* is not criticism. Perhaps not; if one is willing to exclude all Pater's criticism of poetry and art and all Swinburne's prose and nearly all interpretative analysis of poets by kindred minds, all Lamb's notes on the Elizabethans and all Coleridge's, then we can exclude the wonderful, illuminating essay of the great poet, just deceased, upon his great predecessor. Otherwise we must admit it to be, as the Hon. George Wyndham says in the Preface, the most important contribution to pure letters written in English during the last twenty years. Arnold's "Essays in Criticism," he says, did not reach such heights, and the only work he finds for comparison is Myers's "Virgil." Perhaps Pater's "Renaissance" might have been compared with it, but that it stands outside the pale of the twenty years.

No poet more than Shelley needs another poet to stand between him and the gaping multitudes; his ways were not as their ways, nor were his thoughts their thoughts. He took no note of their limitations, but went singing along his seraph way, speaking as if all men were angels now and heaven had already descended to earth. This aloofness from the world and its affairs the late Francis Thompson understands as only a kindred soul can, and he sets forth the explanation in a prose as rich and colored, as luminous and finely wrought, as the highest poetry could be and yet without ever falling into the method or rhythm of poetry.

The essay, originally offered to the "Dublin Review" twenty years ago, was rejected by an editor whose name is wisely withheld and left to drift down the black hallways of oblivion and

* "Shelley." By Francis Thompson. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1909.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ignominy with those of the densest of the Edinburgh reviewers. Had the wonderful essay been accepted, who can foretell how much lustrous and illuminative interpretation might have sprung from the same inexhaustible source? This exquisite bit was saved by Mr. Wilfred Meynell and Mr. Ward, and its publication swiftly sent the "Dublin Review" into a second edition, and the continued demand for the essay brought forth the present slim little volume. Together with the Swinburne essays on Shelley, it forms the most complete and perfect commentary on Shelley the poet and Shelley the man. But apart from its inestimable value as criticism and interpretation, it is an incomparable jewel of English prose, a veritable masterpiece.

There is but a modicum of valuable criticism in the world, and criticism which is at once constructive, minute and scholarly has hardly increased in England since the days of Arnold's "Essays in Criticism," Pater's "Appreciations" and Myers's "Virgil." Beside these classics one may, with perfect assurance, set Mr. Mackail's "Springs of Helicon,"* a volume which stands first in a projected cycle treating of the progress of English poetry, the subject which this poet and critic has chosen to deal with during his tenure of the chair of poetry in Oxford. The gain to all English readers will be incalculable if Mr. Mackail carries out his plan to the end, for he, of all men living, can, to adapt his own words, "make the office of criticism an interpretation of art in much the same way that art is an interpretation of life."

Those who from the beginning have followed Mr. Mackail's career know him the more able to enter into the poet's mind and art that he was, before he became a critic, a notable poet himself, and there are few students of poetry who have not learned to set his initials to the more exquisite poems in a rare and exquisite little volume called "Love in Idleness," which appeared in Oxford at the very beginning of the wonderful eighties of the last century. Perhaps the flow of poetic inspiration was too thin and intermittent, perhaps the age was not suited to the growth of poets; but, at any rate, those who watched and waited

* "The Springs of Helicon." By J. W. Mackail. Sometime Fellow of Balliol College, Professor of Poetry in the University of Oxford. New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1909.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for a successor to Swinburne and Rossetti must herewith accept instead a successor to Matthew Arnold. And who can tell but that hidden away somewhere we may yet come at more of the author's poetry?

At any rate, we have in the present volume essays on Chaucer, Spenser and Milton which are not only penetrating and learned, but which give one the thrill and delight of work which has a universal quality; which compels assent, which has gone to the depths of significance and is more than fine and more than enthralling, it is simply *right*. If one disagrees in some minor points with Mr. Mackail's dicta, one at least knows that it is because one has lived too long in "a world which tends to be obtuse to poetry, to feel safe with dulness, and to take kindly to the second best." Otherwise one might have gone on believing that Milton's fame would ultimately rest upon the delightful and spontaneous products of youth, the "*Comus*," "*Lycidas*," "*Penseroso*" and "*L'Allegro*." But with a guide so great and an intelligence so trained to lead us the minor critic's whole task is that of expressing a profound gratitude and handing on the fame of the book to other readers. To know Robert Bridges's book on "Milton's Prosody" and Mr. Mackail's third essay in this volume is to have all the introduction necessary to the great poet, and, more, it is to have new inspiration to study and to grow.

Mr. Mackail explains that it was no part of his scheme of lectures from the chair to cope with contemporary poets, but the death of Swinburne placed him among the immortals, among those who, in the words of Simonides, οὐ τεθνᾶσι θανοντες being dead are yet alive. Mr. Swinburne, it will be remembered, although Mr. Mackail does not mention it, was one of the glories of Balliol College, and one well remembers the anecdote of the young and enthusiastic student who in the year '82, at his first breakfast with Jowett, asked the redoubtable head which had been Swinburne's rooms and received in the rasped and high-pitched voice of the master the irritated reply: "They were number ——, Mr. B——, so far as that can be of the slightest interest to any human being." Mr. Mackail describes, as he of all men living is best fitted to do, the blaze and crash of the fame of "Atalanta in Calydon," breaking in upon the poetic stagnation

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

which had preceded it. He tells us how the Olympians shook their heads. Tennyson offered one or two perfunctory and acid compliments, Browning declared it a "fuzz of words," and Matthew Arnold could not see why the world had broken out in loud applause when it had allowed his "Meropé" to be still-born. He explains very clearly how the obloquy heaped upon Swinburne after the publication of "Poems and Ballads" was, after all, but the recoil against the prodigious impact of a new art, in hands of immense genius upon a world in which the artistic sense had gone to sleep and could only be awakened by a shock which set all its nerves tingling. In the slight digression on Swinburne he reprints delightful extracts from Mr. H. D. Traill's parody, namely, that where the amazed world is represented as asking,

"Master, how is it done?"

And receives the lucid explanation,

"Let this thing serve you to know
When the river of rhymes should flow
I turn on the tap and they come."

And also that which shows the master telling how far short his imitators fall:

"They strut like jays in my lendings,
They chatter and screech; I sing:
They mimic my phrases and endings
And rum old Testament ring.
But the lyrical cry isn't in it
And the high gods know in a minute
It isn't the genuine thing."

"The genuine thing," writes Mr. Mackail,* "his own writing always was. It was always sincere and ever in a way curiously simple with the simplicity of an extraordinarily eloquent child who makes no reservations or compromises, who has no acquired tact, whose mind is quite transparent." He pays a beautiful tribute to the poet's personality, as it was known to those nearest to him, to his "transparent simplicity, unbounded affectionateness and steady loyalty."

Perhaps it is early yet to give his poetry the full meed of praise and at times Mr. Mackail seems over-cautious, but then it is

* "Swinburne." A lecture delivered before the University of Oxford April 30th, 1909, by J. W. Mackail. Sometime Fellow of Balliol College, Professor of Poetry in Oxford University. Oxford: The Clarendon Press.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the way of the world to hesitate before it lays the laurel wreath on the grave of mortality become immortal.

The truth is one thing, the truth in love is quite another; yet, whether it is of individuals or of nations, the truth to be really effective must be spoken in love. Mr. Collier's admittedly "acquired taste" for the English gives to almost every page of his very readable and suggestive book* a certain tartness not unlike too much lemon in the mayonnaise. Unconsciously he has borrowed something from his subject, perhaps, and is more austere than amiable, more advisory than persuasive. He takes the national manner and national gastronomics somewhat too seriously for cosmopolitan ease, and long as he has lived in England he still looks at the English rather than with them. This is, necessarily, to miss somewhat the collective meaning, however closely may be translated the individual word. Mr. Collier seems inclined to criticise the English more for what they are *not* than for what they are, and he recurringly blames them for falling below their avowed ideals. But can any people be judged thus and be judged fairly? England's supreme achievement is, by the example of her success, however partial, to have inspired in all peoples a love of freedom. And, however lamentable her shortcomings, just as all other birds are fabled to have learned nest-building from the magpie, so all modern governments have gone, consciously or unconsciously, to England for their political models. Politically, she has, at all events, taught even her conquered subjects their aspirations.

Nevertheless, Mr. Collier does see, perceive and understand a great deal, and sets down clearly and frankly his impressions and inferences. The chapter entitled "An English Country Town" is the most charming, perhaps, because the nearest to the author's heart; while that on "Sport" contains matter the least generally known and most suggestive.

It is the more serious portions of the book, however, which cause demur. To speak of the Japanese on one page as "varnished savages" and on another to place them scientifically beside Germany and the United States is surely a contradiction

* "England and the English. From an American Point of View." By Price Collier. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1909.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in thought and in terms; while to suggest that an immediate war with Germany is the surest and quickest way to restore the toppling balance of England's commercial power—is much like advising a man to spend his principal in order to increase his income. These summary pronouncements and hasty conclusions cannot but cast doubt upon the capable author's own acumen and judgment—a doubt by no means deserved. For Mr. Collier's very noticeable book holds much just criticism with generous and appreciative admiration as well. It will appeal not only to those whose taste is acquired, but also to those whose love is inborn; and it offers more sagacious observation of a general kind than the American dwelling in England is usually able to give.

It remains only to speak a word in praise of Mr. Collier's lucid and fluent style—a style built upon the best English models and the outcome of trained craftsmanship.

"The people fancy they hate poetry, and they are all poets and mystics!" exclaimed Emerson. It is a pleasing affirmation, even if it does not compel unquestioning acceptance. A sufficiently deep probe would no doubt discover the potential mystic and poet in even those of us who are, as Jules Laforgue might say, most irreclaimably quotidian. Let us hug the thought to our bosoms for an ultimate solace. The detached observer of the literary show, in its contemporary processes, has need of some such solace. Certainly it is a rare experience to hear, among the clamorous and strident voices which to-day fill with noise the literary market-place, the voice of the writer who is both poet and mystic—rare enough in that enclosure which is set apart for the formal poet and almost never manifest in any less definitely consecrated region.

What is to be said of a writer who, in our immediate day, ventures to discourse, without the spice of paradox or the soothing balm of sentimentality, of such matters as Solitude, Detachment, the Service of Books, the Use of Symbols, Dreams and Visions, and who speaks of them gravely, profoundly, uncompromisingly: as, in short, a poet and mystic? It is an adventure to daunt the most implacable of philosophers, the most confirmed of visionaries: yet it has been undertaken and accomplished in a book which is as indisputably modern in impulse and quality

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

as it is in the moment of its appearance. This audacious writer is Louise Collier Willcox, and her book is "The Human Way,"* a sheaf of essays, meditative and discursive, upon life and art in their essential aspects.

Mrs. Willcox is not of the current type of pleasantly amiable and aimless essayists. Her Way is no by-path for sentimentalists or for intellectual and spiritual idlers. She is both poet and mystic; she has imagination, sensitiveness, plasticity. Yet she has also what the amiable philosopher of the peptonized school so seldom has—fortifying intellect and profound spiritual intuition. She is a writer who would have made glad the heart of Meredith, for she recognizes brain as "the station for the flight of soul." She is a weaver of dreams; yet she knows that "the laughter of reason refreshed is floriferous, like the magical great gale of the shifty spring deciding for summer." She can write of Friendship, Children, Out-of-doors, with an evident and delightful indifference to the sentimental lure. Wherever her discussions range there issues beauty or illumination. Her culture is mellow and comprehensive, her understanding is ripe and unbaffled; and, like the serene Transcendentalist, she is content to "leave hurry to slaves."

She has produced a book that is as winsome and noble as it is distinguished and exceptional: a book which, one likes to think, brings appreciably nearer that golden hour of fulfilment once seen by Jean Paul Richter—that time "when it shall be light; and when man shall awaken from his lofty dreams and find his dreams still there and that nothing has gone save his sleep."

TRAVEL.

The British officer in his finest flower is a spectacle to make glad the sun and to make strong the earth. Here† we have him in a sort of foot-note to Kipling, another story which should have been told at that great "Conference of the Powers" recorded in "Many Inventions." The tale of the two lions is itself stirring and epical; it is very fine, but the figure of Colonel Patterson

* "The Human Way." By Louise Collier Willcox. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1909.

† "The Man-Eaters of Tsavo and Other East-African Adventures." By Lieutenant-Colonel J. H. Patterson, D.S.O. London: Macmillan & Co., 1908.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is finer. It is rarely that the men who do things can tell of them, but he gives a straightaway vivid narrative that is irresistible. He is as much interested in the railway he built against all sorts of odds as in the big game that he killed by the way; yet every head of game has its own tale, and each that is told is told with Homeric exactitude. He seems to make as much of the lion he stalked, while another stalked him, as of the dangerous mutiny he put down without bloodshed. Always it is the adventure he cares for, always it is life that he wears so lightly. "I felt at once that this was a device to lure me into the narrow part of the ravine where, with gangs in front of me and behind me, there would be no escape; still, I thought I would see the adventure through, whatever came of it, so I accompanied the *jemadar* up the gully." Fiction could not do better than that; it is the very manner of Defoe and Dumas and Mr. Kipling. In the manner, too, of the great adventurers and their great biographers is the matter-of-course indifference to personal danger. "In the whole of my life I have never experienced anything more nerve-shaking than to hear the deep roars of those dreadful monsters growing gradually nearer and nearer. . . . But as something had to be done to keep up the men's spirits, I spent many a weary day crawling on my hands and knees through the dense undergrowth of the exasperating wilderness around us. As a matter of fact, if I had come up with the lions on any of these expeditions, it was much more likely that they would have added me to their list of victims than that I should have succeeded in killing either of them, as everything would have been in their favor." By sheer personality the author has given to his book something which is tantamount to style—by the strength of a complete courage and a trained mastery of men and materials, by the dignity of a great and honorable tradition.

Let it be said at the outset that the authors supply an uncalled-for but admirable map of Persia and Mesopotamia. Let it further be said that the map supplies more agreeable reading than the book*—more instructive, more romantic and very much more

* "Behind the Veil in Persia and Turkish Arabia." By M. E. Hume-Griffith. With narratives of experiences in both countries by A. Hume-Griffith, M.D. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Company. London: Seeley & Co., 1909.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

exciting. The volume is made up of the gentle, ladylike talk of a middle-class Englishwoman, rather an invalid, who has a good deal of trouble with her servants. It all served, doubtless, at afternoon tea when she was at home again among her friends, with her husband coming in toward the end of the call to drink his cup of tea on the hearth rug and add his own reminiscences to the tepid flow. But the good pair serve to prove at their own expense that writing should be left strictly to those who have made a profession of it. Any reporter could have made a better job for them. All the reality has dropped out between the sentences here; all that must have been alive and human and pitiful and kindly or simply comic they have left unsaid. "It is not a very pleasant sensation to be lost in a desert. Only once did this experience befall us, and then we were glad when it was over," says Mrs. Hume-Griffith, as if she had been telling about getting caught in a shower at a garden-party or meeting bees a-swarming on the way home from church. The resolution not to talk of the religious side of their lives was grounded, doubtless, on a wholesome distaste of cant, but it is a pity that, if they did feel that all natives are liars, they should have set it down so nonchalantly. Not a few pages, which it were unkind to call peevish, help the reader to understand why Asiatics do not love even the best-intentioned Europeans; and there are other passages, which it were unkind to call unctuous, which help the reader to understand why such Europeans as strongly love the East, or, indeed, any strange lands at all, should be, in their own words, so "down on missionaries."

There are some books, as there are some people, so honest, so earnest, so on the right side about many vital matters, that one really wishes that if they cannot be better they would at least be worse. Of these is this "Simple Account of Japan as it Is, Was and Will [*sic*] Be." The author is very open-minded and admires Japan heartily; is sincere as well as candid, frankly stopping at the confines of present knowledge; and rather pleasant and sensible in disposition. The book* is comely. Light in the hand and illustrated with sixteen reproductions of classical Japanese prints. It is in good taste, as far as the eye can go. But

* "The Empire of the East." By H. B. Montgomery. Chicago: A. C. McClurg & Co. London: Methuen & Co., 1909.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

it is written by the younger brother of Browning's friend, "Mr. Gigadibs, the literary man," and written throughout in what is called "*journalese.*" If the point of view were only as good as the cover, and if the English were only as irreproachable as the press-work! Everywhere crops up the split infinitive, with the misrelated participle and the interminable clause between an article and its noun. Common words are abused till they do not know themselves. *Effete* is used repeatedly for *obsolete; perfunctory* for *superficial; jejune* for *naïve.* Everywhere there is a kind of trite shrewdness: among the rival missionaries "the Japanese conclude that as they cannot all be right they may possibly all be wrong"; of the public wash-houses common to the two sexes shocked travellers have felt "better the custom of the lower classes in England never to wash at all." This is all very well; it is fighting the devil with his own weapons. But the author, when it comes to art, is sadly to seek, and seems never to have heard of the great Chinese schools from which came all that is best in Japan; nor of the actual Chinese paintings stolen long ago which are the glory of Japan. The author seems, indeed, to have no real notion of China, except as the source of a coolie supply that may one day take to manufacturing for herself. The very title of the book belongs, of course, to China by rights. And when it comes to profounder matters, these are even worse. After quoting rather a fine bit on the Orient, without naming the source, our journalist goes on: "The fact, if it be a fact, that the Emperor of China never wears a sword, is in one sense interesting, but it proves nothing." But it proves everything! Whoever cannot see the significance of "that worship of feeling which casts around poverty the halo of greatness impresses his stern simplicity of apparel on the Indian prince, and sets up in China a throne whose imperial occupant, alone amongst the great secular rulers of the world, never wears a sword"—should not touch the East. Yet the book is withal too ingenuous for condemnation, and young Mr. Gigadibs, with his little liberalities, is rather engaging than otherwise.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WORLD-POLITICS.

LONDON: BERLIN: WASHINGTON.

LONDON, *August, 1909.*

ONE of the penalties of being an Englishman, of being, indeed, a member of any European community, is that you can never quite banish from your mind the possibility that your country may one day be successfully invaded. The nervousness, the sense of insecurity and the periodic "scares" that are thus generated form, perhaps, the most striking of the many differences between the atmosphere of America and of Europe. It never occurs to an American that the fabric of his national existence may at a moment be overthrown by a foreign foe; but such an apprehension is rarely for long absent from the consciousness of the peoples of the Old World. England, thanks to her insular position, is freer from it than most countries, but even England, once every fifty years or so, has qualms. A century ago she was momentarily expecting a Napoleonic invasion; fifty years ago she was keeping an anxious and wary eye on Louis Napoleon; to-day the sudden rise of German sea power has turned her thoughts once more to the old problem. Within the past few years it has been examined with great thoroughness by both the Liberals and the Conservatives. The views of the latter party were unfolded by Mr. Balfour in a memorable speech he delivered in May, 1905. The views of the present Government were set forth by Mr. Asquith a few days ago. They are practically identical. For the first time in the history of modern England the leaders of the two chief parties, backed by the best strategical brains in the country, are virtually in complete agreement on the essential points of the naval and military policy and position of the British Empire.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

One of the few useful deeds of the Balfour Ministry, which came to a well-deserved end in 1905, was the creation of the Committee of Imperial Defence. The functions of this Committee are purely advisory. It has no executive authority whatever. It exists to advise the Prime Minister of the day who nominates its members and can add to or diminish their number as he pleases. Its business is to serve as a connecting-link between the Admiralty and the War Office. In a country situated as is Great Britain innumerable questions of home and Imperial defence crop up that involve both naval and military considerations. In the old days the Admiralty would work out the naval view of these problems and the War Office the military view; but there was no body in existence charged with the duty of co-ordinating the two views, of maintaining a due relation between naval and military requirements, and of studying the larger aspects of strategy in connection with the Empire as a whole. To fill the gap the Imperial Defence Committee was called into existence seven years ago. It serves as an addition to, not as a modification of, the normal administrative machinery. It in no way trenches on the authority and responsibility of the Admiralty, the War Office or the Cabinet. It has, of course, its permanent Secretary, who is a strategist of distinction, and a small and highly efficient office staff drawn, for a couple of years or so, from the best officers in the army and navy; but otherwise it is a body of unusual elasticity. At a full meeting of the Committee there are generally present, in addition to the Secretary and the members of his staff, the Prime Minister, the Secretary for War, the Secretary for Foreign Affairs, the First Lord of the Admiralty, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, the Secretary for India and the Secretary for the Colonies. These represent the Cabinet. Besides them there are the Director of Naval Intelligence and the First Sea Lord representing the Admiralty, and the Director of Military Operations and the Chief of the General Staff representing the army. In addition, special officers who are experts in special problems may be attached to the Committee from time to time on the nomination of the Prime Minister.

It was to this committee that Mr. Balfour some five years ago referred the question of Great Britain's vulnerability to invasion. The conclusions it came to after a long and patient inquiry were adopted by him and explained to the House of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Commons in May, 1905. He described the method by which the committee had approached the problem and the hypothetical conditions, as unfavorable to England as they could with any reason be made, under which it had committed it. "We have not," he said, "gone into generalities about the command of the sea or the superiority of our fleet or this difficulty or that difficulty; we have endeavored to picture to ourselves a clear issue which is very unfavorable to this country, and we have shown, at least to our own satisfaction, that on that hypothesis, unfavorable as it is, *serious invasion of these islands is not an eventuality which we need seriously consider.*" He laid it down as an axiom of home defence that the landing of 70,000 hostile troops in Great Britain was "impossible." Taking France as the hypothetical enemy, Mr. Balfour demonstrated its impossibility on the ground that the transport of 70,000 men would require 210,000 tons of shipping, whereas it had been ascertained that there were, as a rule, only 100,000 tons in the French Channel and Atlantic ports; that even if the transport were available it would be a difficult matter to concentrate it all in one port; that the landing of the force would take forty-eight hours; and that the battleships, cruisers, torpedo craft and submarines attached to the British reserve would be amply sufficient, even in the absence of the sea-going fleets, to repel the attack. Practically the Prime Minister invited his countrymen to dismiss from their minds the possibility of invasion.

Even in 1905 Mr. Balfour's contentions were hotly disputed not only by experts in strategy, but by all who realized the danger of allowing a rich, plethoric, mercantile and unarmed nation to cherish the illusion that its security was unassailable. Since 1905, moreover, the conditions of warfare have considerably changed and the potential power of an attacking force has been largely increased. No one in Great Britain has insisted on the reality of these changes more powerfully than Lord Roberts, who, for the past three or four years, has been conducting a laborious campaign of popular education in an effort to arouse his countrymen to an appreciation of the menace which he is convinced confronts them. Last November, for instance, he returned to the subject in one of the most startling and impressive speeches to which the House of Lords has ever listened. Instead of imagining an invasion from France he imagined one from Germany.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

He showed that vessels suitable for the transport of 200,000 men are at all times available in the northern ports of Germany; that the men could be collected without the fuss or publicity of mobilization arrangements; that they could be embarked in a much shorter time than Mr. Balfour had calculated; that instead of three tons of shipping per man being required, one and a half tons would be sufficient for all purposes; and that with the enormous boat accommodation of the big modern liners, with the frequent practice of the troops in embarking and disembarking, with the education given to the officers of the German merchant marine serving in the reserve, and with the various mechanical appliances that now exist, "the disembarkation of German troops could be carried out far more expeditiously than had been thought possible in the case of French troops." Remembering that the German Government owned the railroads and could operate with a secrecy and despatch unattainable in England, that the North Sea offered chances of escaping detection that were absent in the case of the English Channel, and that there were some 80,000 Germans, almost all of them trained soldiers, already resident in the United Kingdom, Lord Roberts expressed his deliberate conviction that 150,000 German troops could be landed in Great Britain, that in the absence of the regular army there was no force adequate to the task of repelling them, and that it was the bounden duty of the country to set about organizing a national citizen army of at least a million men.

These conclusions were startling not only in themselves, but because they showed the greatest British soldier of the age to be absolutely at variance with the considered judgment and policy of the Government on the most crucial question that any nation can be called upon to consider. With the Government declaring that an invasion by 70,000 men was impossible and Lord Roberts declaring that an invasion by 150,000 men was perfectly practicable, it was at least clear that the matter was not yet disposed of. When the present Government came into office Lord Roberts laid his case before them and asked for a fresh inquiry into the whole problem. Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman assented, and in November, 1907, a subcommittee of the Committee of Imperial Defence, under the chairmanship of Mr. Asquith, was appointed to thresh the question out once more. The subcommittee sat for nearly a year. It listened to a full presenta-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion of his case from Lord Roberts. It heard a great deal of independent evidence from other officers and from naval and military experts. It studied with great care all the changes in the strategical situation and in what one might call the potentialities of invasion. It went minutely, for instance, into such matters as the possible time and mobilization of foreign armies, their facilities for transport by land and sea, the organization and distribution of their forces, both naval and military, and the possibilities as regards embarkation, time of transit and means of disembarkation in England of a successful invasion on a large scale. It deliberately postulated circumstances that unreasonably favored a foreign descent upon the British shores and unreasonably weakened the means of repelling it. It imagined, for instance, the invasion occurring without any forewarning and at a time when the bulk of the British regular forces were out of the country. On this basis it conducted its inquiry and arrived unanimously at two conclusions which were expounded by Mr. Asquith in an admirably lucid speech on July 29th.

The first conclusion was that so long as British naval supremacy is adequately assured, invasion on a large scale is "an absolutely impracticable operation," and that if Great Britain once loses command of the sea no amount of military strength, not even an army as large as the German, will save her from invasion and from inevitable subjection by the enemy. It follows from this that supremacy at sea is the supreme and vital interest of the country. Is, then, an army for home defence unnecessary? By no means. An army for home defence is necessary—this is the second conclusion of the committee—for two purposes; in the first place to repel raids—that is to say, sporadic offensive expeditions which are so small in numbers that they can evade even the best and most vigilant fleet; and in the second place to compel an enemy who wishes to inflict serious damage on the country to come in such force, if he comes at all, that there can be no question of his slipping undetected through the net of the navy. The smallest force which an enemy would need to invade England with such effect as to influence the issue of the struggle has been put by nearly all the British authorities at 70,000 men. But if an invasion of this magnitude were to be attempted, then the Admiralty is confident that it could not reach British shores unperceived and that, once sighted, it could be satisfactorily dealt

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

with. To assume that 70,000 men could get through undetected, in the opinion of all naval experts, is to allow a generous margin for errors and accidents. In such matters, however, it is well to be amply and even unnecessarily on the safe side. The Government, therefore, lays it down as an axiom that the home defence forces of the country must be equal to repelling an invasion of 70,000 men. A navy capable of defeating any reasonably possible combination of Powers, and a home army capable of dealing with a hostile force of 70,000 men—on these conditions it is the opinion of the Defence Committee and of the Government that England will be safe from invasion.

BERLIN, *August, 1909.*

ON July 14th the German Emperor accepted Prince von Bülow's resignation, and for the fourth time in his reign exercised the right of appointment of an Imperial Chancellor. After the famous audience at Potsdam last November, when the Chancellor "described to His Majesty the feelings which had been excited among the German people" by the "Daily Telegraph" interview, Prince von Bülow's tenure of office became dependent upon ability to re-establish by positive successes a position which had lost its strongest support. Every fresh reiteration of the fact that he continued to enjoy his master's "confidence" bore witness to change in the old intimate relations. There was no question of dismissal, and there was no intrigue. But the atmosphere became more and more bleak and cheerless, and Prince von Bülow, at least as early as April, had begun to pave a way of retreat. Until Easter fortune seemed to smile. Although the German intervention in St. Petersburg at the end of March was prepared under the personal auspices of the Emperor, the Chancellor was given the credit of its brilliant success, and the "Austro-German triumph" sheds bright if to some extent artificial lustre upon memorial notices of Prince von Bülow's official career. When the Balkan crisis passed, Germany was for two excited months engrossed in the latest of many attempts to increase Imperial revenue. Experienced observers, remembering that the Chancellor had never exhibited more than a superficial interest in the financing of his policy, assumed that he would make the traditional appeals to national honor. But they listened in vain

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for the sounds of the national drum. With only spasmodic attempts at conciliation, Prince von Bülow watched the crumbling away of the Liberal-Conservative *bloc* which he invented two and a half years ago. When its disruption was plain to all the world, and the Conservatives, unmoved by his threats of resignation, calmly went their way, he neither encouraged the Liberals to make further sacrifices to the *bloc* idea, nor seriously attempted to accommodate himself to any sort of co-operation with the restored Centre-Conservative majority. He seems to have believed almost to the last that the Conservatives might shrink before a decision which they knew would lead up to his resignation. But he knew that the Emperor would accept his resignation, and he was more anxious to depart with what dignity he might than to avert departure.

It is at least doubtful whether the *bloc,* an almost accidental and an essentially barren union of unequal and antagonistic political, social and economic forces, could in any event have survived the pressure of legislation which, under the ambitious name of Imperial Finance Reform, has ended in the imposition of a nominal £25,000,000 a year of fresh taxation of the kind to which the German Empire has been condemned since the exhaustion of the French War Indemnity. The Liberalism in whose defence Prince von Bülow would now have it supposed that he has been sacrificed never attempted more than to leaven the great lump of indirect taxation. The Conservatives, who have been deeply impressed by foreign experience, and especially by the course of British finance from the Death Duties of Sir W. Harcourt to the Budget of Mr. Lloyd George, never recognized the necessity to yield any tax upon property which might later on be screwed up in accordance with Imperial needs and Imperial deficits. In such circumstances the opportunity of the Centre, which is the strongest but at the same time the most enlightened and broadest based clerical party in the world, with no fear of losing seats at elections and with wide appeals to other than purely Catholic sympathies, was bound to come. The opportunity came and was taken, the Centre and the Conservatives composed their own scheme of indirect taxes, combined with taxes on dividend coupons, checks, and so on, which completed the rout of the financial and commercial interests of the Left, and Prince von Bülow, waiting only to fulfil the final duties of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a broker between the new majority which he would not accept and the Federal council which accepted its gifts, retired.

In October, 1900, Prince Hohenlohe, in farewell audience of the Emperor at Homburg, was "pleasantly surprised" that His Majesty "at once mentioned Bülow, who, at any rate, at the moment, is the best man." Prince von Bülow, in his last days in Berlin, has expressed much warmer approval of his successor, for whose nomination, indeed, he claims the initiative. Although Prince von Bülow is understood, in fact, to have "proposed" Herr von Bethmann-Hollweg to the Emperor at his own farewell audience in the garden of the Berlin Schloss, the proposal was an empty formality. The idea of appointing the Secretary of State for the Navy, Admiral von Tirpitz, had been rejected on prudential grounds. Count Wedel, sometime a cavalry general, later Ambassador in Rome and in Vienna, and now Statthalter of Alsace-Lorraine, could up to the last have been the successor. When it was finally known that Count Wedel would not venture upon a new career with more than a probability that the special relationships which it involves would be severely strained Herr von Bethmann-Hollweg stood alone.

The record of the new Chancellor is that of a thoroughly efficient and more than usually intelligent Prussian administrator who, after twenty years of very hard work in comparative obscurity, had the good fortune to attain to Ministerial rank at a moment of opportunity. He earned no special distinction as Prussian Minister of the Interior from 1905 to 1907. But he was invaluable to Prince von Bülow, who trusted implicitly both his soundness of judgment and his knowledge, and counted rightly upon his loyalty. When Prince von Bülow got rid, in 1907, of Count Posadowsky, one of the very few commanding figures in German Imperial politics, Herr von Bethmann-Hollweg succeeded in filling the office of Imperial Secretary of State for the Interior without attracting any lasting attention to the fact that Prince von Bülow had banished a great public servant. A master of details, which he has expounded in innumerable speeches as dull and decorous as they were able, he has stirred few prejudices and has earned in almost all quarters vague feelings of sympathy and respect rather than definite favor or disfavor. Totally lacking though he is in at least the superficial qualities which have for so long served to keep Prince von Bülow in favor, Herr

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

von Bethmann-Hollweg owes his appointment not least to the fact that the Emperor contemplates relations with his fifth Chancellor with complete satisfaction. In foreign politics, of which Herr von Bethmann-Hollweg has no technical knowledge—although he has some personal knowledge of the life and institutions of countries, England among them, of which Prince von Bülow's ignorance was almost boundless—he will, indeed, be pupil rather than adviser of the Emperor for some time to come. But, whoever the pilot be, the course is for the present clearly enough marked. In view of the recent demonstration of German solidarity in Europe, the wounds caused by Prince von Bülow's pin-pricks can be left to heal, and Germany can devote herself, with undiminished zeal, but with less demonstrativeness, to separate cultivation of the sympathies of Powers with whose alliances and friendships she disclaims any desire to interfere.

The new Imperial Chancellor has every reason to go slow. He would welcome a period of calm in international politics, not so much with a view to revising, in the course of mastering, the policy bequeathed to him as in order to disentangle the threads of domestic controversy before committing himself in regard to the next phase of German *Weltpolitik*. Although a good deal will depend upon Herr von Bethmann-Hollweg's period of initiation, there is no reason to suppose that it will end in any considerable departure from the steady pursuit of power by means of naval expansion and commercial penetration.

Herr von Bethmann-Hollweg has now to reshape Government relations with the political parties. There is little or no reality in current speculation as to whether he will be a "Liberal" or a "Conservative" Chancellor. Such talk is in Germany an abuse of language. Every Chancellor is, in the nature of things, compelled to take his majority where he can find it, or as best he can make it, and no Chancellor has lost sight of the fact without finding reason to regret it. Only two years ago Prince von Bülow hoped for the political epitaph, "He was an Agrarian Chancellor." Prince von Bülow now covers his retreat with imprecations upon the Conservatives, dismal forebodings of Socialist triumphs at the next elections, and the insinuation that the real cause of his fall is fidelity to Liberalism. The new Chancellor's record in administrative and departmental work suggests, indeed, that he has strong sympathies for a progressive social

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

policy, and even that he has a more genuine belief than any other German Minister, except Count Posadowsky, in the possibility of treating popular dissatisfaction at the burdens of Empire by frequent homœopathic doses of "social reform." For the main business of the next decade, however, no Chancellor can long be diverted by predispositions or ideals from the work of organizing and exploiting "national" sentiment and ambitions. If Herr von Bethmann-Hollweg finds the present Reichstag sufficiently "serviceable" for him to avoid a dissolution for one or even two more years—when dissolution would coincide with the climax in naval construction upon the scale at present provided by law—he will have abundant occasion to gauge prospects and test possibilities. The question of reform of the Prussian Franchise, in regard to which even the vague promises made by Prince von Bülow last year did much to stiffen the Conservative resolve to end alliance with the Left, will perhaps be the first test of the new *régime*. The deficiencies of the new scheme of taxation, which certainly will not yield £25,000,000 of new revenue, or anything like it, will be apparent next year, when the battle over "finance reform" may break out afresh. And the readjustment of commercial relations with America, as a sequel to the termination of the Commercial Agreement, will give new point to the antagonism between Agrarianism and industrial "Liberal" interests.

Meanwhile there is little evidence of Herr von Bethmann-Hollweg's own view of the internal problem. Presumably he hopes by virtue of being unprejudiced to be met without prejudice, and to erect a workable Parliamentary machine which shall neither be the old Conservative-Centre alliance as such nor the Conservative-Centre *bloc* which has just perished. If he succeeds his success will be due to two main causes. The first is the great revival of Socialist hopes, in consequence of the disillusions of the *bloc* period, and especially of the imposition of taxes which are not merely unpopular, but will be persistent irritants. The second is the fervent desire of the Centre, after two years of enforced exile, to strengthen the security of their tenure by becoming more and more a national party. The Chancellor may, then, hope to profit even more than his predecessor by the fear of Socialism, and to find in the Centre a more pliable instrument, capable, on reasonable terms, of affording

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

him help against excessive claims of the Right no less than against exaggerated pretensions of disorganized national Liberals and Radicals. Many people believe that political forces in Germany are rapidly gravitating and settling down in a fashion to leave little or no room for small and separate parties between Right and Left. Such prophecies are premature, and will be premature until Imperial enthusiasts have discovered at least a basis of agreement regarding Imperial Economics and Imperial Finance.

At least until then German policy, in whatever hands, must remain as opportunist at home as it is admittedly opportunist abroad. The nimble tread and tripping tongue of Prince von Bülow give place to the solemnity of Herr von Bethmann-Hollweg. But there is no essential change. Least of all can it be imagined that because Prince von Bülow chose to make a Parliamentary rebuff the occasion of retirement, Germany has moved far, or is about to move far, towards a Parliamentary *régime* or government by public opinion.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *August, 1909.*

AT 2.10 P.M. on August 5th the conference report on the Payne-Aldrich bill was passed in the Senate by a vote of 47 to 31. The last legislative step in the enactment of the measure was thus taken. Before the report was submitted to a vote speeches were made by several Senators both for and against it. Senator Dolliver of Iowa made a notable attack upon the measure; Senator Elkins of West Virginia criticised it after a fashion; Senators Warren and Heyburn supported it. Senator Bailey of Texas explained the Democratic position, and Senator Aldrich defended the bill.

Senator Dolliver, speaking against the cotton and wool rates reported by the conferees, told the Senate distinctly that the cotton rates had been raised as high in some instances as 113 per cent. over the Dingley rates, although the conference committee had no legal right to do so. He also charged that both the new cotton and woollen rates had been written by persons who were not members of Congress. In vigorous language he predicted the downfall of the policy of protection if the leaders of the Republican party continued to gather around any one

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"citadel of protection," as they had gathered around the wool schedule in the Payne-Aldrich bill. He ended by saying that personally he "would not be a party to a swindle of the American people," and if retired from Congress would at least enjoy the "rest and dignity of private life with a clear conscience." Six other Republican Senators, representing the Middle West, namely, Beveridge of Indiana, Bristow of Kansas, Clapp of Minnesota, Cummins of Iowa, La Follette of Wisconsin, and Nelson of Minnesota, voted against the report. The politically important section of the country of which these seven "progressive" Senators were the spokesmen is, for the moment at all events, disaffected to the verge of mutiny. It remains to be seen whether, as is hoped by the Senators responsible for the present law, Mr. Taft can and will soothe and placate the disappointed voters, who had been led by the pledges made to them during the last Presidential campaign to believe that the new tariff law would be "a substantial revision downward." The phrase scarcely fits the bill which went to the President for his signature on August 5th.

The tariff bill which was to settle everything has settled nothing. This is evident from the vehement opposition shown to the last by Republicans in both chambers, from the statement made by the President when he attached his signature to the measure, and from the subsequent reception of the law by press and people. It is certain that no previous Republican tariff has been passed with such emphatic Republican disapproval stamped upon it. When the McKinley bill came up for final passage only one indisputably Republican Senator voted against it. For the Dingley bill in 1897 the solid Republican vote in the Senate was cast. Nothing so significant and so ominous as the unbending resistance now offered by seven Republican Senators from the Middle West has ever before attended the passage of a high tariff bill. Unless something is done to conciliate the Republicans of the Middle West, disaster to the Republican party seems sure to follow.

A recognition of the wide-spread dissatisfaction is discernible in President Taft's statement. He signs the bill for the sake of its good features, while frankly conceding that it is not "a complete compliance with the promises made." He intimates distinctly that the end is not yet. Speaking of the power conferred upon him to employ skilled agents to investigate the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

actual working of the new tariff, he remarks that they will be enabled to acquire information "under circumstances favorable to its truth," plainly implying by the quoted words that many of the so-called facts laid before Congress were so many lies. The President also said that the exact facts, as these shall be furnished by the Tariff Commission, will provide a basis for "future Executive recommendations," by which can only be meant recommendations to Congress to change certain schedules. The President here strikes the right note if, as we believe, he really wants to make the best of a bad business. The only way, indeed, of soothing a man who feels that he has been cheated is to show that you propose to correct the injustice done him. Men in the Middle West are now convinced, as the speeches of the Iowa Senators show, that many parts of the Payne-Aldrich bill were designed to rob them, and when the President goes out to talk to them they will want to know what he is going to do about it. If he means to go to the root of their discontent, as we assume that he does, he will have to let it be seen that he is determined to use every weapon in his power to redress tariff wrongs. The result may be piecemeal revision, but as things are now that seems to be the only remedy for piecemeal stealing.

If there is any man in either branch of Congress who seems to have been irreparably damaged by the tariff debate and its legislative outcome it is Senator Nelson W. Aldrich, of Rhode Island. It certainly looks as if the day of his influence were done. His name is, to-day, throughout the land a synonym for grasping and corrupt legislation. For months he has been standing athwart reasonable tariff revision, antagonizing and disembowelling the best features of the House bill, rallying to his support the worst men in public life and repelling the best, driving one-sixth of his party in the Senate into open revolt, and throughout making himself the attorney for selfish and unscrupulous interests. It is not necessary to charge the Rhode Island Senator with personal corruption, for it is indisputable that he has been the willing servant of unscrupulous and corrupt men and corporations. The fact is known of all men, and if Mr. Aldrich comes forward next winter as the sponsor and framer of a bill for currency reform the effect will be unmistakable. Ask any intelligent and disinterested Congressman what chance there would be of passing an Aldrich currency measure and he will

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

answer, "None whatever." Currency reformers cannot afford to prejudice their great undertaking by intrusting it to the guidance of a Senator whose motives are hopelessly discredited, and whose latest public activity has been in contemptuous disregard of the needs and desires of the whole country.

While the public mind was preoccupied with the shaping of the tariff, it was natural that too little attention should be paid to the course adopted by our State Department with reference to our treaty right to share in the lending of the moneys needed by China for railways and other internal improvements. While our financiers seemed indifferent, the Peking Government agreed to borrow from German, British and French bankers $27,500,000, the sum requisite for beginning the construction of a railway from Hankow to Szechuen. No serious attempt to claim for the United States a share in the opportunity was made until Mr. Taft entered the White House. Soon thereafter China's attention was directed to the existence of the Conger agreement of 1904 by which the Peking Government promised that in case she needed funds for railway construction it would apply to Great Britain and the United States. The inevitable result was that a larger aggregate loan was fixed upon, and that one-quarter of it is to be forthcoming from the American Republic. We need not dwell on the importance of this achievement.

Fortunately, we now have a President who knows the Far East from prolonged personal observation, and who is fully alive to the reasons for expecting an enormous and a rapid development of China. The development of the resources of the Middle Kingdom, as the administration views it, will require her to contract a large foreign debt which she is abundantly able to support, and to expend hundreds of millions of dollars in the purchase of materials abroad and, ultimately, in the creation of industrial establishments at home. Shall the United States have at least a fair share of this vast expenditure, or shall it remain indifferent and see the profits monopolized by British, German and French capitalists? What answer Mr. Taft makes to this question is evident from our State Department's demand that American bankers shall be permitted to exercise their treaty right to supply part of the funds needed to start the Hankow-Szechuen Railway, which otherwise would be a transaction of no superlative importance.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE EDITOR'S DIARY.

On the Burning up of Boys.

ARE our boy champions burning out too much energy in athletic games, wasting stamina that never can be replaced, wrecking instead of building up their constitutions? The doctors and the elderly athletes, informed by research and experience, answer yes to the question. The young athletes laugh and shout no. It is not enough for age to reply that the boys will know better some day and so pass sadly about their business. It ought to be possible for the ripe in years, remembering always the deference due to young hotheads, to persuade them to listen with some degree of patience to wise admonition. For there are abundant signs on every hand that if we do not manage somehow to check and restrain the overleaping ambition of our fiery youths we shall accumulate within the next score of years some tens of thousands of broken-down athletes who are of little use to themselves and a detriment to humanity.

But how to check the boy athletes? There's the rub. Stevenson, that perpetual youth, tells us that when crabbed age croaks reproachfully, "At your age I thought as you do now," youth will ever reply, "And when I reach your age I shall probably think as you do now." This is the dialogue that will go on as long as generation marches after generation. Yet the present case is urgent, and some means must be found to curb young irrepressible; for if we do not curb him we shall inevitably be burdened with a multitude of human cast-offs, who before they reach middle age are burned out physically and must, in consequence, be mentally affected as well.

Within the memory of men who have still to discover their first gray hair the schoolboy champion was a thing unknown. Growing boys played hard and grew strong. No need exists to point out the absolute need of play in the proper development of young humans. But the schoolboys of yesterday had no cham-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pion sprinters and distance-runners and hard-driven football gladiators willing to die in the last ditch if need be. The hardest strife was reserved until the youngster, prepared by years of vigorous play, reached college and a nearer approach to maturity.

But when we Americans, at last awakened to the benefits to be derived from athletic training, began to take games seriously we were not content to acquire reasonable results. With characteristic impetuousness we rushed to extremes, and to-day there is no school, public or private, so small or so obscure that it has not its champion "man" in some branch of sport. The boys, fired by ambition to excel, are throwing themselves into competitions with as great and unreasoning zeal as that which drives money-maddened speculators in the pursuit of wealth.

What are the results? Lads in the period of adolescence, when the vital energies should be expended quite as much in upbuilding and increasing the bony framework and its muscles, nerves and organs, as in the repair of tissues consumed by exertion, are exhausting themselves in strife that leaves them prostrated even when victorious. Heart, lung, muscular and nerve tissues are consumed to an extent abnormal in the period of early growth. The vital forces repair the loss and cause abnormal growth in these directions in order to meet the oft-repeated strain. The balance and harmony of forces in the individual are destroyed. The boy long before he attains his majority has developed in some respects the power of a man, but at the expense of a frightfully lowered vitality. Doctors tell us that broken-down athletes of the age of thirty are not uncommon nowadays. We cannot have our cake and eat it too. If we compel the sapling to bear the burden of the tree we cannot expect much from it when it reaches the tree period.

For years it has been notorious that most American race-horses have been trained and raced so hard in their two-year-old form that only the exceptionally vigorous animals are good for much as three-year-olds and upward. The cast-offs are sold for a song, and they eke out a miserable existence at labor for which they were not intended. But can we afford, under the guise of beneficial athletic culture, to burn up the energies of our human colts? If they become cast-offs, what future is there for them? And what must be the effect upon the nation which thus wastes its strongest, most ambitious and courageous individuals?

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED